NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. DXXX.

JANUARY, 1901.

THE STATUS OF ANNEXED TERRITORY AND OF ITS FREE CIVILIZED INHABITANTS.

BY BENJAMIN HARRISON, FORMERLY PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

A LEGAL argument upon this subject is quite outside of my purpose, which is to consider, in a popular, rather than a professional, way, some of the questions that arise, some of the answers that have been proposed, and some of the objections to these answers.

We have done something out of line with American history, not in the matter of territorial expansion, but in the character of it. Heretofore, the regions we have taken over have been contiguous to us, save in the case of Alaska—and, indeed, Alaska is contiguous, in the sense of being near. These annexed regions were also, at the time of annexation, either unpeopled or very sparsely peopled by civilized men, and were further, by their situation, climate and soil, adapted to the use of an increasing American population. We have now acquired insular regions, situated in the tropics, and in another hemisphere, and hence unsuitable for American settlers, even if they were not, as they are, already populated, and their lands already largely taken up.

Copyright, 1900, by THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW PUBLISHING COMPANY. All rights reserved.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We have taken over peoples rather than lands, and these chiefly of other race stocks—for there are "diversities of tongues." The native labor is cheap and threatens competition, and there is a total absence of American ideas and methods of life and government among the eight or more millions of inhabitants in the Philippines. We have said that the Chinese will not "homologate"; and the Filipinos will certainly be slow. Out of the too late contemplation of these very real and serious problems has arisen the proposition to solve them, as many think, by wresting our government from its constitutional basis; or at least, as all must agree, by the introduction of wholly new views of the status of the people of the territories, and of some startlingly new methods of dealing with them. It is not open to question, I think, that, if we had taken over only the Sandwich Islands and Porto Rico, these new views of the status of the people of our territories, and these new methods of dealing with them, would never have been suggested or used.

The question of the constitutional right of the United States to acquire territory, as these new regions have been acquired, must, I suppose, be taken by every one to have been finally adjudged in favor of that right. The Supreme Court is not likely to review the decision announced by Chief Justice Marshall.

It is important to note, however, that the great Chief Justice derives the power to acquire territory, by treaty and conquest, from the Constitution itself. He says:

> "The Constitution confers absolutely on the government of the Union the powers of making war and of making treaties: consequently that government possesses the power of acquiring territory either by conquest or by treaty."

While this decision stands, there is no room for the suggestion that the power of the United States to acquire territory, either by a conquest confirmed by treaty, or by a treaty of purchase from a nation with which we are at peace, is doubtful, and as little for the suggestion that this power is an extra-constitutional power. The people, then, have delegated to the President and Congress the power to acquire territory by the methods we have used in the cases of Porto Rico and the Hawaiian and Philippine Islands. But some have suggested that this power to acquire new territory is limited to certain ends; that it can only be used to acquire territory that is to be, or is capable of being, erected into States of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Union. If this view were allowed, the attitude of the courts to the question would not be much changed; for they could not inquire as to the purposes of Congress, nor, I suppose, overrule the judgment of Congress as to the adaptability of territory for the creation of States. The appeal would be to Congress to limit the use of the power.

The islands of Hawaii, of Porto Rico and of the Philippine Archipelago have been taken over, not for a temporary purpose, as in the case of Cuba, but to have and to hold forever, as a part of the region over which the sovereignty of the United States extends. We have not put ourselves under any pledge as to them, at least not of a written sort. Indeed, we have not, it is said, made up our minds as to anything affecting the Philippines, save this: that they are a part of our national domain and that the inhabitants must yield obedience to the sovereignty of the United States, so long as we choose to hold them.

Our title to the Philippines has been impeached by some upon the ground that Spain was not in possession when she conveyed them to us. It is a principle of private law that a deed of property adversely held is not good. If I have been ejected from a farm to which I claim title and another is in possession under a claim of title, I must recover the possession before I can make a good conveyance. Otherwise, I sell a law suit and not a farm, and that the law counts to be immoral. It has not been shown, however, that this principle has been incorporated into international law; and, if that could be shown, there would still be need to show that Spain had been effectively ousted.

It is very certain, I suppose, that if Great Britain had, during our revolutionary struggle, concluded a treaty of cession of the colonies to France, we would have treated the cession as a nullity and continued to fight for liberty against the French. No promises of liberal treatment by France would have appeased us.

But what has that to do with the Philippine situation? There are so many points of difference. We were Anglo-Saxons! We were capable of self-government. And, after all, what we would have done under the conditions supposed has no bearing upon the law of the case. It is not to be doubted that any international tribunal would affirm the completeness of our legal title to the Philippines.

The questions that perplex us relate to the status of these

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

new possessions, and to the rights of their civilized inhabitants who have elected to renounce their allegiance to the Spanish crown, and either by choice or operation of law have become American—somethings. What? Subjects or citizens? There is no other status, since they are not aliens any longer, unless a newspaper heading that recently attracted my attention offers another. It ran thus: "Porto Ricans not citizens of the United States *proper.*" Are they citizens of the United States *improper,* or improper citizens of the United States? It seems clear that there is something improper. To call them "citizens of Porto Rico" is to leave their relations to the United States wholly undefined.

Now, in studying the questions whether the new possessions are part of the United States, and their free civilized inhabitants citizens of the United States, the Constitution should, naturally, be examined first. Whatever is said there, is final—any treaty or act of Congress to the contrary notwithstanding. The fact that a treaty must be constitutional, as well as an act of Congress, seems to have been overlooked by those who refer to the treaty of cession as giving to Congress the right to govern the people of Porto Rico, who do not retain their Spanish allegiance, according to its pleasure. Has the Queen Regent, with the island, decorated Congress with one of the jewels from the Spanish Crown?

In Pollard *vs.* Hogan, 3 Howard, the court says:

> "It cannot be admitted that the King of Spain could by treaty, or otherwise, impart to the United States any of his royal prerogatives; and much less can it be admitted that they have capacity to receive or power to exercise them."

A treaty is a part of the supreme law of the land in the same sense that an act of Congress is, not in the same sense that the Constitution is. The Constitution of the United States cannot be abrogated or impaired by a treaty. Acts of Congress and treaties are only a part of the "supreme law of the land" when they pursue the Constitution. The Supreme Court has decided that a treaty may be abrogated by a later statute, on the ground that the statute is the later expression of the sovereign's will. Whether a statute may be abrogated by a later treaty, we do not know; but we do know that neither a statute nor a treaty can abrogate the Constitution.

If the Constitution leaves the question open whether the in-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

habitants of Porto Rico shall or shall not upon annexation become citizens, then the President and the Senate may exercise that discretion by a treaty stipulation that they shall or shall not be admitted as citizens; but if, on the other hand, the Constitution gives no such discretion, but itself confers citizenship, any treaty stipulation to the contrary is void. To refer to the treaty in this connection is to beg the question.

If we seek to justify the holding of slaves, in a territory acquired by treaty, or the holding of its civilized inhabitants in a condition less favored than that of citizenship, by virtue of the provisions of a treaty, it would seem to be necessary to show that the Constitution, in the one case, allows slavery, and, in the other, a relation of civilized people to the government that is not citizenship.

Now the Constitution declares (14th Amendment) that "all persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States." This disposes of the question, unless it can be maintained that Porto Rico is not a part of the United States.

But the theory that any part of the Constitution, of itself, embraces the Territories and their people, is contested by many. Congress seems to have assumed the negative, though among the members there was not entire harmony as to the argument by which the conclusion was reached. It is contended, by most of those who defend the Porto Rican bill, that the Constitution expends itself wholly upon that part of the national domain that has been organized into States, and has no reference to, or authority in, the Territories, save as it has constituted a government to rule over them.

No one contends that every provision of the Constitution applies to the Territories. Some of them explicitly relate to the States only. The contention of those who opposed the Porto Rican legislation is that all of those general provisions of the Constitution which impose limitations upon the powers of the Legislative, Executive and Judicial Departments must apply to all regions and people where or upon whom those powers are exercised. And, on the other hand, those who deny most broadly that the Constitution applies to the Territories seem practically to allow that much of it does. The powers of appointment and pardon in the Territories, the confirmation of Territorial officers, the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

methods of passing laws to govern the Territories, the keeping and disbursement of federal taxes derived from the Territories, the veto power, and many other things, are pursued as if the Constitution applied to the cases.

But, in theory, it is claimed by these that no part of the Constitution applies except the 13th Amendment, which prohibits slavery, and that only because the prohibition expressly includes "any place subject to their jurisdiction." This Amendment was proposed by Congress on February 1st, 1865—the day on which Sherman's army left Savannah on its northern march; and the words "any place subject to their jurisdiction" were probably added because of the uncertainty as to the legal status of the States in rebellion, and not because of any doubt as to whether Nebraska, then a Territory, was a part of the United States.

The view that some other general limitations of the Constitution upon the powers of Congress must relate to all regions and all persons was, however, adopted by some members of the Senate Committee in the report upon the Porto Rican bill, where it is said:

> "Yet, as to all prohibitions of the Constitution laid upon Congress while legislating, they operate for the benefit of all for whom Congress may legislate, no matter where they may be situated, and without regard to whether or not the provisions of the Constitution have been extended to them; but this is so because the Congress, in all that it does, is subject to and governed by those restraints and prohibitions. As, for instance, Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; no title of nobility shall be granted; no bill of attainder or ex post facto law shall be passed; neither shall the validity of contracts be impaired, nor shall property be taken without due process of law; nor shall the freedom of speech or of the press be abridged; nor shall slavery exist in any place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States. These limitations are placed upon the exercise of the legislative power without regard to the place or the people for whom the legislation in a given case may be intended."

That is to say, every general constitutional limitation of the powers of Congress applies to the Territories. The brief schedule of these limitations given by the committee are all put in the negative form, "Congress shall not"; but surely it was not meant that there may not be quite as effective a limitation by the use of the affirmative form. If a power is given to be used in one way only, all other uses of it are negatived by necessary implication. When it is said, "All duties, imposts and excises shall be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

uniform throughout the United States," is not that the equivalent of "No duty or excise that is not uniform shall be levied in the United States." And is not the first form quite as effective a limitation of the legislative power over the subject of indirect taxation as that contained in the fourth clause of the section is upon the power to lay direct taxes?

In the latter the negative form is used, thus:

> "No capitation or other direct tax shall be laid, unless in proportion to the census of enumeration hereinbefore directed to be taken."

This discrimination between express and implied limitations, benevolently attempted to save for the people of the Territories the bill of rights provision of the Constitution, will not, I think, endure discussion.

There are only three views that may be offered, with some show of consistency in themselves:

First, that Congress, the Executive and the Judiciary are all created by the Constitution as governing agencies of the nation called the United States; that their powers are defined by the Constitution and run throughout the nation; that all the limitations of their powers attach to every region and to all civilized people under the sovereignty of the United States, unless their inapplicability appears from the Constitution itself; that every guaranty of liberty, including that most essential one, uniform taxation, is to be allowed to every free civilized man and woman who owes allegiance to the United States; that the use of the terms "throughout the United States" does not limit the scope of any constitutional provision to the States that would otherwise be applicable to the Territories as well; but that these terms include the widest sweep of the nation's sovereignty, and so the widest limit of Congressional action.

Second, that the terms, "The United States," define an inner circle of the national sovereignty composed of the States alone; that, whenever those terms are used in the Constitution, they must be taken to have reference only to the region and to the people within this inner circle; but that, when these terms of limitation are omitted, the constitutional provisions must, unless otherwise limited, be taken to include all lands and people in the outer circle of the national sovereignty.

Third, that the Constitution has relation only to the States

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and their people; that all constitutional limitations of the powers of Congress and the Executive are to be taken to apply only to the States and their citizens; that the power to acquire territory is neither derived from the Constitution, nor limited by it, but is an inherent power of national life; that the government we exercise in the Territories is not a constitutional government, but an absolute government, and that all or any of the things prohibited by the Constitution as to the States, in the interest of liberty, justice and equality, may be done in the Territories; that, as to the Territories, we are under no restraints save such as our own interests or our benevolence may impose.

I say "benevolence"; but must not that quality be submerged, before this view of the Constitution is promulgated? It seems to have had its origin in a supposed commercial necessity, and we may fairly conclude that other recurring necessities will guide its exercise. Is it too much to say that this view of the Constitution is shocking?

Within the States, it is agreed that the powers of the several departments of the national government are severely restrained. We read that Congress shall have power, and again that Congress shall not have power. But neither these grants nor these inhibitions have, it is said, any relation to the Territories. Against the laws enacted by the Congress, or the acts done by the Executive, there is no appeal, on behalf of the people of the Territories, to any written constitution, or bill of rights, or charter of liberty. We offer them only this highly consolatory thought: a nation of free Americans can be trusted to deal benevolently with you.

How obstinately wrong we were in our old answer to the Southern slave-holder! It is not a question of kind or unkind treatment, but of human rights; not of the good or bad use of power, but of the power, we said. And so our fathers said, in answer to the claim of absolute power made on behalf of the British Parliament. As to the States, the legislative power of Congress is "all legislative powers herein granted." (Art. 1, sec. 1.) As to the Territories, it is said to be all legislative power—all that any Parliament ever had or ever claimed to have, and as much more as we may claim—for there can be no excess of pretension where power is absolute. No law relating to the Territories, passed by Congress, can, it is said, be declared by the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Supreme Court to be inoperative, though every section of it should contravene a provision of the Constitution.

An outline of a possible law may aid us to see more clearly what is involved:

Sec. 1. Suspends permanently the writ of Habeas Corpus in Porto Rico.

Sec. 2. Declares an attainder against all Porto Ricans who have displayed the Spanish flag since the treaty of peace.

Sec. 3. Grants to the native mayors of Ponce and San Juan the titles of Lord Dukes of Porto Rico, with appropriate crests.

Sec. 4. Any Porto Rican who shall speak disrespectfully of the Congress shall be deemed guilty of treason. One witness shall be sufficient to prove the offense, and on conviction the offender shall have his tongue cut out; and the conviction shall work corruption of blood.

Sec. 5. The Presbyterian Church shall be the Established Church of the Island, and no one shall be permitted to worship God after any other form.

Sec. 6. All proposed publications shall be submitted to a censor and shall be printed only after he has approved the same. Public meetings for the discussion of public affairs are prohibited and no petitions shall be presented to the government.

Sec. 7. No inhabitant of Porto Rico shall keep or bear arms.

Sec. 8. The soldiers of the Island garrison shall be quartered in the houses of the people.

Sec. 9. The commanding officer of the United States forces in the Island shall have the right, without any warrant, to search the person, house, papers and effects of any one suspected by him.

Sec. 10. Any person in Porto Rico, in civil life, may be put upon trial for capital or other infamous crimes upon the information of the public prosecutor, without the presentment or indictment of a grand jury; may be twice put in jeopardy for the same offense; may be compelled to be a witness against himself, and may be deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law, and his property may be taken for public uses without compensation.

Sec. 11. Criminal trials may, in the discretion of the presiding judge, be held in secret, without a jury, in a district prescribed by law after the commission of the offense, and the accused shall, or not, be advised before arraignment of the nature or cause of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the accusation, and shall, or not, be confronted with the witnesses against him, and have compulsory process to secure his own witnesses, as the presiding judge may in his discretion order.

Sec. 12. There shall be no right in any suit at common law to demand a jury.

Sec. 13. A direct tax is imposed upon Porto Rico for federal uses without regard to its relative population; the tariff rates at San Juan are fixed at fifty per cent. and those at Ponce at fifteen per cent. of those levied at New York.

New Mexico, or Arizona, or Oklahoma might be substituted for Porto Rico in the bill; for, I think, those who affirm that the Constitution has no relation to Porto Rico do so upon grounds that equally apply to all other Territories.

Now, no one supposes that Congress will ever assemble in a law such shocking provisions. But, for themselves, our fathers were not content with an assurance of these great rights that rested wholly upon the sense of justice and benevolence of the Congress. The man whose protection from wrong rests wholly upon the benevolence of another man or of a Congress, is a slave—a man without rights. Our fathers took security of the governing departments they organized; and that, notwithstanding the fact that the choice of all public officers rested with the people. When a man strictly limits the powers of an agent of his own choice, and exacts a bond from him, to secure his faithfulness, he does not occupy strong ground when he insists that another person, who had no part in the selection, shall give the agent full powers without a bond.

If there is anything that is characteristic in American Constitutions, State and national, it is the plan of limiting the powers of all public officers and agencies. "You shall do this; you may do this; you shall not do this"—is the form that the schedule of powers always takes. This grew out of our experience as English colonies. A government of unlimited legislative or executive powers is an un-American government. And, for one, I do not like to believe that the framers of the National Constitution and of our first State Constitutions were careful only for their own liberties.

This is the more improbable when we remember that the territory then most likely to be acquired would naturally be peopled by their sons. They cherished very broad views as to the rights

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of men. Their philosophy of liberty derived it from God. Liberty was a Divine gift to be claimed for ourselves only upon the condition of allowing it to "all men." They would write the law of liberty truly, and suffer for a time the just reproach of a departure from its precepts that could not be presently amended.

It is a brave thing to proclaim a law that condemns your own practices. You assume the fault and strive to attain. The fathers left to a baser generation the attempt to limit God's law of liberty to white men. It is not a right use of the fault of slavery to say that, because of it, our fathers did not mean "all men." It was one thing to tolerate an existing condition that the law of liberty condemned, in order to accomplish the Union of the States, and it is quite another thing to create a condition contrary to liberty for a commercial profit.

In a recent discussion of these questions, sent me by the author, I find these consolatory reflections: "And yet the inalienable rights of the Filipinos, even if not guaranteed by the Constitution, are amply secured by the *fundamental, unwritten* laws of our civilization." Does this mean that the specific guarantees of individual liberty found in our Constitution have become a part of "our civilization," and that they apply in Porto Rico and the Philippines in such a sense that, if there is any denial of them by Congress or the Executive, the courts can enforce them and nullify the law that infringes them? If that is meant, then as to all such rights this discussion is tweedledum and tweedledee—the Constitution does not apply, but all these provisions of it are in full force, notwithstanding.

Perhaps, however, it should be asked further, whether the rule of the uniformity of taxation is a part of the "law of our civilization"; for, without it, all property rights are unprotected. The man whose property may be taxed arbitrarily, without regard to uniformity within the tax district and without any limitation as to the purposes for which taxes may be levied, does not own anything; he is a tenant at will.

But if these supposed "laws of our civilization" are not enforcible by the courts, and rest wholly for their sanction upon the consciences of Presidents and Congresses, then there is a very wide difference. The one is ownership; the other is charity. The one is freedom; the other slavery—however just and kind the master may be.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The instructions of the President to the Taft Philippine Commission seem to allow that any civil government under the authority of the United States, that does not offer to the people affected by it the guarantees of liberty contained in the Bill of Rights sections of the Constitution, is abhorrent. Speaking of these, he said:

"Until Congress shall take action, I directed that, upon every division and branch of the government of the Philippines, must be imposed these inviolable rules:

" 'That no person shall be deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law; that private property shall not be taken for public use without just compensation; that in all criminal prosecutions the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation, to be confronted with the witnesses against him, to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the assistance of counsel for his defense; that excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishment inflicted; that no person shall be put twice in jeopardy for the same offense, or be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself; that the right to be secure against unreasonable searches and seizures shall not be violated; that neither slavery nor involuntary servitude shall exist except as a punishment for crime; that no bill of attainder, or ex post facto law shall be passed; that no law shall be passed abridging the freedom of speech or of the press, or of the rights of the people to peaceably assemble and petition the government for a redress of grievances; that no law shall be made respecting the establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, and that the free exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship without discrimination or preference shall forever be allowed."

The benevolent disposition of the President is well illustrated in these instructions. He conferred freely—"until Congress shall take action"—upon the Filipinos, who accepted the sovereignty of the United States and submitted themselves to the government established by the Commission, privileges that our fathers only secured after eight years of desperate war. There is this, however, to be noted, that our fathers were not content to hold these priceless gifts under a revocable license. They accounted that to hold these things upon the tenure of another man's benevolence was not to hold them at all. Their battle was for rights, not privileges—for a Constitution, not a letter of instructions.

The President's instructions apparently proceed upon the theory that the Filipinos, after civil government has superseded the military control, are not endowed under our Constitu-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion, or otherwise, with any of the rights scheduled by him; that, if he does nothing, is silent, some or all of the things prohibited in his schedule may be lawfully done upon, and all the things allowed may be denied to, a people who owe allegiance to that free Constitutional government we call the United States of America.

It is clear that those Porto Ricans who have not, under the treaty, declared a purpose to remain Spanish subjects, have become American citizens or American subjects. Have you ever read one of our commercial treaties with Great Britain or Germany, or any other of the kingdoms of the world? These treaties provide for trade intercourse, and define and guarantee the rights of the people of the respective nations when domiciled in the territory of the other. The descriptive terms run like this: "the subjects of Her Britannic Majesty" on the one part, and "the citizens of the United States" on the other. Now, if the commercial privileges guaranteed by these treaties do not, in their present form, include the Porto Ricans who strewed flowers before our troops when they entered the Island, we ought at once to propose to our "Great and Good Friends," the Kings and Queens of the Earth, a modification of our conventions in their behalf.

Who will claim the distinction of proposing that the words "and subjects" be introduced after the word "citizens"? There will be no objection on the part of the King, you may be sure; the modification will be allowed smilingly.

We have never before found it necessary to treat the free civilized inhabitants of the Territories otherwise than as citizens of the United States.

It is true, as Mr. Justice Miller said, that the exclusive sovereignty over the Territories is in the national government; but it does not follow that the nation possesses the power to govern the Territories independently of the Constitution. The Constitution gives to Congress the right to exercise "exclusive legislation" in the District of Columbia; but "exclusive" is not a synonym of "absolute." When the Constitution says that "treason against the United States shall consist only in levying war against them, or in adhering to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort," there is a limitation of the legislative power; and it necessarily extends to every venue where the crime of treason against the United States may be laid, and to every person upon whom its penalties may be imposed.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This constitutional provision defining the crime of treason and prescribing the necessary proofs is a Bill of Rights provision. In England, under Edward II., "there was," it was said, "no man who knew how to behave himself, to do, speak or say, for doubt of the pains of such treasons." The famous statute of Edward III., defining treasons, James Wilson declares, "may well be styled the legal Gibraltar of England." (Wilson's Works [Andrews] v. 2, p. 413.)

Mr. Madison, speaking of this section of the Constitution, says in the "Federalist":

> "But as new fangled and artificial treasons have been the great engines by which violent factions, the natural offspring of free government, have usually wreaked their malignity on each other, the convention have with great judgment opposed a barrier to this peculiar danger, by inserting a constitutional definition of the crime," etc.

Mr. Madison believed that there was a real danger that statutes of treason might be oppressively used by Congress. What have we been doing, or what have we a purpose to do, that we find it necessary to limit the safeguards of liberty found in our Constitution, to the people of the States? Is it that we now propose to acquire territory for colonization, and not, as heretofore, for full incorporation? Is it that we propose to have Crown Colonies, and must have Crown law? Is it that we mean to be a World Power, and must be free from the restraints of a Bill of Rights? We shall owe deliverance a second time to these principles of human liberty, if they are now the means of delivering us from un-American projects.

The particular provision of the Constitution upon which Congress seems to have balked, in the Porto Rican legislation, was a revenue clause, viz., the first paragraph of section 8 of Article 1, which reads:

> "The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defence and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States."

There was only one door of escape from allowing the application of this clause to Porto Rico. It was to deny that the Territories are part of the United States.

It will be noticed that the descriptive term, "The United States," is twice used in the one sentence—once in the clause defining the purposes for which only duties and imposts may be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

levied, and once in the clause requiring uniformity in the use of the power. Is there any canon of construction that authorizes us to give to the words, "The United States," one meaning in the first use of them and another in the second? If in the second use the Territories are excluded, must they not also be excluded in the first? If the rule of uniformity does not apply to the Territories, how can the power to tax be used in the United States, to pay the debts and provide for the defense and general welfare of the Territories? Can duties be levied in New York and other ports of the States, to be expended for local purposes in Porto Rico, if the Island is not a part of the United States?

Are the debts that may be contracted by what the law calls the body politic of "The People of Porto Rico" for local purposes, part of the debt of the United States—notwithstanding that the Island is no part of the United States and the people are not citizens of the United States? But some one will say that the Island is one of our outlying defenses, and that fortifications and naval stations and public highways there are necessary to the "common defense." Well, is it also true that education and poor relief, and fire and police and health protection, and all other agencies of local order and betterment in Porto Rico, are included in the words "the general welfare of the United States"? It would seem that a region of which it can be said that its general welfare is the general welfare of the United States, must be a part of the United States, and its people citizens of the United States.

For the first time Congress has laid tariff duties upon goods passing from a Territory into the States. The necessity for this radical departure from the established practice of the government seems to have been to find a safe basis for the holding and governing of regions, the free introduction of whose products might affect the home industries unfavorably, and the admission of whose people to citizenship might imply future Statehood—or at least the right of migration and settlement in the States of an undesirable population. That the diversity of tongues in the Philippines, and the utter lack of the American likeness in everything there, presented strong reasons against the acquisition of the islands, I freely admit.

It must also be conceded that when, as we are told, Providence laid upon us the heavy duty of taking over and governing these islands, it was very natural that we should seek to find a way of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

governing them that would save us from some of the unpleasant consequences which a discharge of the duty in the old way involved. But do we not incur a greater loss and peril from the new doctrine, that our Congress and Executive have powers not derived from the Constitution, and are subject to no restraints or limitations in the Territories, save such as they may impose upon themselves?

Are the civil rights of the dwellers on the mainland well secured against the insidious under-wear of greed and ambition, while we deny to the island dwellers, who are held to a strict allegiance, the only sure defense that civil rights can have—the guarantees of constitutional law? Burke saw in the absolute powers claimed for Parliament, in the American colonies, danger to the liberties of Parliament itself. As so often quoted, he said:

> "For we are convinced, beyond a doubt, that a system of dependence which leaves no security to the people for any part of their freedom in their own hands, cannot be established in any inferior member of the British Empire without consequentially destroying the freedom of that very body in favor of whose boundless pretensions such a scheme is adopted. We know and feel that arbitrary power over distant regions is not within the competence, nor to be exercised agreeably to the forms or consistently with the spirit, of great popular assemblies."

Are we, in this day of commercial carnival, incapable of being touched by such considerations, either in our fears or in our sense of justice? Is it not likely to be true that the moral tone of the Republic—our estimation of constitutional liberty—will be lessened by the creation of a body of civilized people over whom our flag waves as an emblem of power only? The flag cannot stand for the benevolent policies of an administration. It stands for more permanent things—for things that changing administrations have no power to change. Is it not in the nature of a mockery to raise the flag in Porto Rico and bid its hopeful people hail it as an emblem of emancipation, while the Governor we have sent them reads a proclamation, from the foot of the staff, announcing the absolute power of Congress over them?

How would the pioneers of the West have regarded a declaration that they were not citizens of the United States, or a duty laid upon the furs they sent to the States, or upon the salt and gunpowder sent from the States in exchange, even if a preference of 85 per cent. had been given them over the people of Canada?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is safe to say that no such interpretation of the Constitution, or of the rights of the people of a Territory, will ever be offered to men of American descent.

If the Constitution, so far as it is applicable, attaches itself, whether Congress will or no, to all territory taken over as a part of the permanent territory of the United States, it is there to stay as fundamental law. But if it is not so, an act of Congress declaring that the Constitution is "extended" is not fundamental law, but statute law, and may be repealed; and is repealed by implication, *pro tanto,* whenever Congress passes a law in conflict with the provisions of the "extended" Constitution. If the Constitution as such, as fundamental law, is extended over new territory, it must be the result of an act done—an act the effect of which is in itself, not in any accompanying declaration.

If the act of annexation does not carry the Constitution into a Territory, I can think of nothing that will, save the act of admitting the Territory as a State.

The situation of the Porto Rican people is scarcely less mortifying to us than to them; they owe allegiance but have no citizenship. Have we not spoiled our career as a delivering nation? And for what? A gentleman connected with the beet-sugar industry, seeing my objections to the constitutionality of the law, and having a friendly purpose to help me over them, wrote to say that the duty was absolutely needed to protect the beet-sugar industry. While appreciating his friendliness, I felt compelled to say to him that there was a time for considering the advantages and disadvantages of a commercial sort involved in taking over Porto Rico, but that that time had passed; and to intimate to him that the needs of the beet-sugar industry seemed to me to be irrelevant in a constitutional discussion.

The wise man did not say there was a future time for everything; he allowed that the time for dancing might be altogether behind us, and a less pleasant exercise before us. We are hardly likely to acquire any territory that will not come at some cost.

That we give back to Porto Rico all of the revenue derived from the customs we levy, does not seem to me to soften our dealings with her people. Our fathers were not mollified by the suggestion that the tea and stamp taxes would be expended wholly for the benefit of the colonies. It is to say: We do not need this money; it is only levied to show that your country is no part of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the United States, and that you are not citizens of the United States, save at our pleasure. When tribute is levied and immediately returned as a benefaction, its only purpose is to declare and maintain a state of vassalage.

But I am not sure that the beet-sugar objection is not more tenable than another, and probably more controlling consideration, which ran in this wise: "We see no serious commercial disadvantages, and no threat of disorder, in accepting Porto Rico to be a part of the United States—in that case it seems to be our duty; but we have acquired other islands in the Orient, of large area, populated by a turbulent and rebellious people; and, if we do by the Porto Ricans what our sense of justice and of their friendliness prompts us to do, some illogical person will say that we must deal in the same way with the Philippines. And some other person will say that the free intercourse was not given by the law but by the Constitution."

I will not give a license to a friend to cut a tree upon my land to feed his winter fire, because my enemy may find in the license a support for his claim that the wood is a common!

If we have confidence that the Constitution does not apply to the Territories, surely we ought to use our absolute power there with a view to the circumstances attending each call for its exercise. Not to do this, shows a misgiving as to the power.

The questions raised by the Porto Rican legislation have been discussed chiefly from the standpoint of the people of the Territories; but there is another view. If, in its tariff legislation relative to merchandise imported into the Territories and to merchandise passed from the Territories into the States, Congress is not subject to the law of uniformity prescribed by the Constitution, it would seem to follow that it is within the power of Congress to allow the admission to Porto Rico of all raw materials coming from other countries free of duty, and to admit to all ports of the "United States proper," free of duty, the products manufactured from these raw materials. As the people of the "United States proper" choose the Congressmen, there may be no great alarm felt over this possibility; but it is worth while to note that a construction of the Constitution adopted to save us from a competition with the Territories on equal grounds, is capable of being turned against us and to their advantage.

The courts may not refuse to give to the explicit words of a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

law their natural meaning, by reason of the ill consequences that may follow; but they may well take account of consequences in construing doubtful phrases, and resolve the doubts so as to save the purpose of the law-makers, where, as in the case of the constitutional provision we are considering, that purpose is well known. They will not construe a doubtful phrase so as to allow the very thing that the law was intended to prevent.

These constitutional questions will soon be decided by the Supreme Court. If the absolute power of Congress is affirmed, we shall probably use the power with discrimination by "extending" the Constitution to Porto Rico and by giving to its people a full Territorial form of government, and such protection in their civil rights as an act of Congress can give. If the court shall hold that the Constitution, in the parts not in themselves inapplicable, covers all territory made a permanent part of our domain, from the moment of annexation and as a necessary part of the United States, then we will conform our legislation, with deep regret that we assumed a construction contrary to liberty, and with some serious embarrassments that might have been avoided.

There has been with many a mistaken apprehension that, if the Constitution, of its own force, extends to Porto Rico and the Philippines, and gives American citizenship to their free civilized people, they become endowed with full political rights; that their consent is necessary to the validity and rightfulness of all civil administration. But no such deduction follows. The power of Congress to legislate for the Territories is full. That is, there is no legislative power elsewhere than in Congress, but it is not absolute. The contention is that all the powers of Congress are derived from the Constitution—including the power to legislate for the Territories—and that such legislation must necessarily, always and everywhere, be subject to the limitations of the Constitution.

When this rule is observed, the consent of the people of the Territories is not necessary to the validity of the legislation. The new territory having become a part of the national domain, the people dwelling therein have no reserved legal right to sever that relation, or to set up therein a hostile government. The question whether the United States can take over or continue to hold and govern a territory whose people are hostile, is not a question of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

constitutional or international law, but of conscience and historical consistency.

Some one must determine when and how far the people of a Territory, part of our national domain, can be entrusted with governing powers of a local nature, and when the broader powers of Statehood shall be conferred. We have no right to judge the capacity for self-government of the people of another nation, or to make an alleged lack of that faculty an excuse for aggression; but we must judge of this matter for our Territories. The interests to be affected by the decision are not all local; many of them are national.

These questions are to be judged liberally and with strong leanings to the side of popular liberty, but we cannot give over the decision to the people who may at any particular time be settled in a Territory. We have, for the most part, in our history given promptly to the people of the Territories a large measure of local government, and have, when the admission of a State was proposed, thought only of boundaries and population. But this was because our Territories have been contiguous and chiefly populated from the States.

We are not only at liberty, however, but under a duty, to take account also of the quality and disposition of the people, and we have in one or two instances done so. The written Constitution prescribes no rule for these cases. The question whether the United States shall hold conquered territory, or territory acquired by cession, without the consent of the people to be affected, is quite apart from the question whether, having acquired and incorporated such territory, we can govern it otherwise than under the limitations of the Constitution.

The Constitution may be aided in things doubtful by the Declaration of Independence. It may be assumed that the frame of civil government adopted was intended to harmonize with the Declaration. It is the preamble of the Constitution. It goes before the enacting clause and declares the purpose of the law; but the purpose so expressed is not the law unless it finds renewed expression after the enacting clause. We shall be plainly recreant to the spirit and purpose of the Constitution, if we arbitrarily deny to the people of a Territory as large a measure of popular government as their good disposition and intelligence will warrant. Necessarily, the judgment of this question, however, is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with Congress. The Constitution prescribes no rule—could not do so—and the courts cannot review the discretion of Congress.

But we are now having it dinned into our ears that expansion is the law of life, and that expansion is not practicable if the Constitution is to go with the flag. Lord Salisbury, some years ago, stated this supposed law of national life. In a recent address, Mr. James Bryce says, by way of comment:

> "He thinks it like a bicycle, which must fall when it comes to a standstill. It is an awkward result of this doctrine that when there is no more room for expansion, and a time must come, perhaps soon, when there will be no more room, the Empire will begin to decline."

If Great Britain, with her accepted methods of territorial growth, finds the problem of growth by expansion increasingly hard, it will be harder for us, for we are fettered by our traditions as to popular rights, at least—if not by our Constitution.

But expansion is not necessarily of a healthy sort; it may be dropsical. If judgment is passed now, the attempted conquest of the Boer Republics has not strengthened Great Britain. She has not gained esteem. She has not increased her loyal population. She has created a need for more outlying garrisons—already too numerous. She has strained her military and financial resources, and has had a revelation of the need of larger armies and stronger coast-defenses at home. The recent appeal of Lord Salisbury at the Lord Mayor's banquet for more complete island defenses is most significant. Did the South African war furnish a truer measure of the Empire's land strength than the familiar campaigning against half-savage peoples had done? The old coach, with its power to stand as well as to move, may after all be a safer carriage, for the hopes and interests of a great people, than the bicycle.

Some one will say, increasing years and retirement and introspection have broken your touch with practical affairs and left you out of sympathy with the glowing prospects of territorial expansion that now opens before us; that it has always been so; the Louisiana and the Alaskan purchases were opposed by some fearful souls. But I have been making no argument against expansion. The recent acquisitions from Spain must present widely different conditions from all previous acquisitions of territory, since it seems to be admitted that they cannot be allowed to become a part of the United States without a loss that overbalances the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gain; that we can only safely acquire them upon the condition that we can govern them without any constitutional restraint.

One who has retired from the service, but not from the love of his country, must be pardoned if he finds himself unable to rejoice in the acquisition of lands and forests and mines and commerce, at the cost of the abandonment of the old American idea that a government of absolute powers is an intolerable thing, and, under the Constitution of the United States, an impossible thing. The view of the Constitution I have suggested will not limit the power of territorial expansion; but it will lead us to limit the use of that power to regions that may safely become a part of the United States, and to peoples whose American citizenship may be allowed. It has been said that the flash of Dewey's guns in Manila Bay revealed to the American people a new mission. I like rather to think of them as revealing the same old mission that we read in the flash of Washington's guns at Yorktown.

God forbid that the day should ever come when, in the American mind, the thought of man as a "consumer" shall submerge the old American thought of man as a creature of God, endowed with "unalienable rights." BENJAMIN HARRISON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PAST EVENTS AND COMING PROBLEMS.

BY M. DE BLOWITZ.

It is when a man begins to understand that his life is drawing to a close that he feels an ardent curiosity to lift the veil which hides the future. From the vantage point whence his view stretches over the years that have rolled by, years which he fancies have brought him a certain experience, he is tempted inevitably to draw conclusions as to the future, and to seek to sketch out the grand lines of the book of the morrow as the sequel to the pages of yesterday.

The following lines need no other explanation than this. They have no other *raison d'être*. Indifferent as to the past, with no special enthusiasm for the present, which has nothing new to offer me, and after long years during which, in thousands of columns, I have loyally recounted, and often accurately judged, the every-day incidents of my time, and, above all, the so extraordinary events which I have witnessed, I should like now, without wishing to become a prophet, to indicate the problems with which the coming century will have to deal, the questions which it will have to examine and to solve.

It is naturally of France that I intend first to speak, pending the moment when I am free to speak of the other nations, for France is the country which I have most closely observed; moreover, since the beginning of the century, and even to-day, France has been and is the central point of attraction, the point which solicits universal attention, and from which radiate those general influences which are agitating the world. But, on my route, I shall try to cast furtive but scrutinizing glances in various directions, seeking to discover the possible nature of the drift of events as the generations advance deeper and deeper into the opening century.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

When the nineteenth century began, the events that were taking place in France were agitating the world. Every one gazed thither in expectation for the solution of the problems which she had raised in ridding herself of the monarchy. Every one was waiting beyond the borders for the first breath, from over the frontiers, of that new spirit which was destined to transform the ancient world; and there was not a convulsion which shook the surface of France that had not its echo and its consequences in the trembling of the planet. The axe which had severed from its body the head of the king seemed a menace for all the royal lines of Europe, and the coalition of Europe was but the reply to the challenge flung in its face by France. The dawn of the century now ending was a French dawn. French philosophers, French law-givers, French writers, French painters and French soldiers were the terror, the horror or the admiration of kings and peoples. They expected from France either the worst or the best, according as they had something to gain or to lose by the new gospel of liberty and equality, of which she appeared to be wishing to sow the seeds.

Then it was that rose and loomed on the horizon the fast-invading glory of the man who was in himself the synthesis of all the types of human greatness and ambition, who aspired to realize every form of human domination, who inspired every hatred, every fear, every indignation, every admiration, every fanaticism, and whose name, even to-day, after the numberless convulsions which for a century have shaken French soil, dominates every other, drowning in its splendor, as the sun its satellites, every other name which arose with his, or has arisen since on the horizon of history. Yes, any effort to appreciate the nineteenth century in France brings the inquirer at every point face to face, either in an attitude of adulation or of indignation, with the name of Napoleon I., and so great is this name that all who since have sought to use it for their own aggrandizement or interest have merited the jeers of the universe or the disdainful fury of those who had been able really to estimate the achievements of this Colossus.

I am perfectly alive to the mistakes and blunders, even the crimes, of Napoleon I. History has noted them; the public conscience has branded them. But the effects of these mistakes and blunders and these crimes have now been spent, and only the vast

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

conceptions of this reformer, of this law-giver, of this supreme genius in the art of war, have survived. Thus, since his disappearance, since his eclipse on the horizon of the modern world, every luminary which has appeared, in France at least, has seemed merely an accidental apparition, and since him no man has been a sufficiently energetic pilot to steer the French bark toward a port where it could find shelter from the storms and anchor in safety. Since 1815, ever since the day when St. Helena opened to receive him, like the country from whose bourne no traveller returns, France has been like the flotsam and jetsam of the waves, now lifted high on the summits of the sea, but more often precipitated into the abyss. Régime has succeeded régime; experiments in government have been multiplied at more or less varied intervals; and each time France, deceived in her hopes and expectations, frustrated in her sacrifices, has had her dreams dissipated by the constant evocation of a reality which has shattered her illusions. The royalty which dubbed itself "Legitimate," because it strove to hark back to the real past, misunderstanding the immensity of the genius whom it succeeded, conceived, like an aged pigmy ruminating mighty thoughts, the extravagant idea of effacing the work and memory of the giant whose shoes it so rashly sought to don.

After the Restoration, a bastard royalty sought to place one foot on the ground of the traditional dynasty, and the other on that of modern concessions; but, almost unnoticed, without shock or outcry, it tottered and fell in the silent abandonment of a principle ill-defined. Once more a provisional Republic, attempting to create for itself, like the others, a legitimacy, rose on the ruins of the modern Monarchy of July; but the advent of a man who was proclaimed the descendant of the giant—of a man who, with no notion of its weight, dared bear the burden of Napoleon's name—sufficed to compass the speedy check of this attempt at a Republic, and the new Napoleon, almost with impunity, throttled, if I may so say, the law, and seized France, still trembling at the thought of beholding a Napoleon seated on her secular throne. Then again, following upon the defeat which had made to totter and to crumble the throne of the Second Empire, a Republic, the anonymous refuge which was opened up in the path of France fleeing before destiny, was set up; and it now closes a century of incessant agitations, a century which began in revolution, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which has ended without having even yet exhausted, by any definitive solution, the cycle of its political experiments.

Thus far each of the attempts made by France, since the beginning of the nineteenth century, to obtain, if not repose, at least stability, has left behind it a certain quantity of floating wreckage, tossed hither and thither as events change, and often accumulating in vast sargasso seas of obstruction at the entrance of every port of refuge. Each régime has left behind it a dangerous plague which I shall define the plague of social parasitism. And no sooner, vanquished by the years, does one generation of these parasites disappear, than another rises to take its place, and to continue its devastating corrosive work. This is the ill from which France has suffered for a century, and from which it is still suffering. Each successive régime has absorbed the privileged persons of the régime that preceded it, who had changed their convictions without tempering their appetites, or discarding their presumption and audacity. The "Old Régime" left behind it the privileged classes who claimed the right to live at the expense of the nation. These persons were gathered up by the Empire, which, in absorbing them, fancied that it legitimized its own government by their adhesion, whereas it had merely perpetuated the social parasitism resulting from the exaggerated privileges accorded by the old régime to its favorites. When the Empire disappeared, it in turn bequeathed its privileged classes, its own parasites, mingled with those of the old régime, to the "legitimate royalty." And so, from government to government, from régime to régime, has been growing and extending the parasitic mass; so that to-day, over a France which fancies itself democratic and which aspires to be so, stretches like an immense, constantly shifting blotch, this social parasitism, these throngs of individuals always discontented, always with unslaked thirst, always ready to upset existing things on the chance of finding a place or reaping an advantage by a possible upheaval.

I have insisted at this length upon what I have called social parasitism in France—and which, indeed, exists in many other countries as well to a greater or less degree—because it seems to me to constitute for France the veritable danger against which she will have to do battle during the coming century, and which she must learn to conjure away if she would escape the perils which beset the existence of nations.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In France, the malady of social parasitism dates from the origin of the Revolution, and each successive generation has handed on to its successor, down to our own times, the constantly accumulating mass of those who hold that the law of labor was not made for them, that they are privileged to remain both idlers and agitators, and that in their case the obligation to bear their share of the national burden of toil does not exist.

In the midst of this France which seems to wish to become really a democracy, the upper aristocracy contemplates, as from a lofty vantage point, with a sincere and almost natural disdain, the vast stretches of the democratic ocean which is throbbing at its feet. But on the slopes of the summit where this party of the aristocracy—which is for France as a whole an object of historic pride—has kept its foothold for a century, have assembled also a heterogeneous collection of doubtful elements, possessing no historic *raison d'être,* but sharing the disdainful and haughty temper of the veritable aristocracy. And these new recruits, although quite without the slightest right, are swelling the ranks of that nation within the nation which, disdainfully and haughtily as drones, views all that exists around it as its natural tributary, and those who are not to the manner born as bound to devote their energies to its own aggrandizement and interests, and slavishly to follow its hests. No régime in France is more responsible for this state of things than the Second Empire. Democratic Cæsarism is the most baneful of all political theories; for Cæsar, in order to render the democracy his docile slave, is bound at once to flatter and degrade it. Thus no régime here since the explosion of the First Revolution had aroused a more profound irritation, a greater wrath, a more violent hatred in its opponents; and so violent was this antagonism that, when this régime crumbled, many of its opponents consoled themselves for the defeat of the Fatherland by their joy at the fall of the Empire.

To-day, however, we may affirm that none of the previous régimes which succeeded one another during the past century has still in this soil, so often and so rudely shaken in the past, roots deep enough for the nation to rise at its summons, and to warrant its hope to exchange its present state for that of any defunct régime whatever, for the nation is fast forgetting them all.

But how happens it that to-day, and indeed now for a decade, France, which no longer suffers from a dynastic malady, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which has ceased to regret the vanished régimes, is nevertheless the prey of incessant torment, of agitations which give her no repose, and that she seems every now and then to be nearing the gravest perils?

The answer to this question is to be found in what has already been said of social parasitism. This immense mob, ever ready to attack existing authority, which it looks upon as frustrating the aspirations that it confounds with its rights, is like a vast army laying untiring siege to the rulers it detests, whom it longs and strives to upset, and that, too, without hesitating to imperil the very existence of the country itself. The immense majority of this opposition which is never at rest cherishes obstinately the dream of the advent of a "saviour." For this end, the independence of humanity, the right to self-government, the will to repudiate the orders and domination of a single man, all the aspirations, in fact, of human dignity, constitute the maddest of unintelligible usurpations. This innumerable army of idle parasites dreams of a master who, by the forced labor of a portion of society, will provide the others with the means of nourishing their laziness and, as they fondly fancy, their unrecognized capacities. They look to find such a master in the absolute form of a monarchy or empire, forgetting that it is not the form of government, but the genius of the rulers, which constitutes the means of salvation. But what seems to justify their theory is that, thus far, the Third Republic has revealed, neither in its successive heads, nor in those who have labored at their side, the scientific mind, the philosopher or the reformer, who, after having properly diagnosed the trouble, has undertaken to discover or apply the remedy.

M. Thiers was an extremely clever man, a perspicacious mind, a man of firm will, a penetrating observer of his time, and a passionate judge of events of the past. But his accession coincided too completely with his country's ruin for him to be able to give his time to dreaming of future remedies; and just when he might have hoped to devote the remainder of his life to the cure of his country's ills, his fall arrested both his hopes and his plans.

Marshal MacMahon was, in the hands of the monarchist conspirators who had concocted and compassed the fall of M. Thiers, merely an unwitting instrument. Happily for his renown, his scrupulous conscience prevented him from being also their crim-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

inal instrument, by becoming the docile puppet of those who had put him in office. He left behind him the memory of an uncompromising integrity, superior to all the allurements of vanity and of a merely passing glory.

M. Jules Grévy displayed in office, which he attained so unexpectedly, the spirit and temper and bearing of a member of the upper middle class, the French *bourgeoisie,* at once sceptical and contented with things as they are; and he considered himself in his post as the representative of the tumultuous wills then agitating Parliament, itself the somewhat vague reflection of the national will.

M. Carnot was, in every sense of the word, an *honnête homme,* upright, modest, wanting in self-confidence, conscientious, unenthusiastic, and without personal ambition. He thought it the supreme honor of his life to have prepared and almost to have carried through the Franco-Russian alliance; but after having thus, as he believed, assured the security of his country abroad, the idea never occurred to him to analyze and to assuage its internal ills.

At the moment of his election M. Casimir Périer seemed to arouse numerous hopes. He is one of the men who have most disappointed both their friends and those who have observed them from afar. He had neither the energy to obtain any real authority, nor sufficient philosophy. The reed broke of itself; and when at Rennes he gave evidence we perceived that this rigid man had resigned only to avoid the successive rebuffs inflicted on his weakness by his associates. And he, too, believed that he had done enough for his country and his own glory in advancing one step further the alliance prepared by M. Carnot.

M. Félix Faure will remain the strangest, the most indecipherable enigma for those who would comprehend the motives of his action, and the spirit in which he held his post. His contact with the Czar Nicholas II. had troubled his vision, the original clearness of which, indeed, remains still to be demonstrated. Having attained the summit of republican power by an inexplicable freak of fortune, he seemed, toward the end of his life, haunted by I know not what vision of enlarged authority; and, paradoxical, improbable as it may seem, those who made overt opposition to the Republic found his ear always open to their suggestions. He, too, believed that he had fulfilled his mission and justified

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the extraordinary hazard which had put him at the head of the most brilliant of nations, in bringing about the public manifestation of the alliance between France and Russia.

But no more than his predecessors at the summit of the political hierarchy has M. Loubet ever dreamed of attempting to probe the wounds from which, however, he himself is personally a sufferer, and which form the chronic malady that menaces the repose and the health of France. M. Loubet is, in every sense of the word, what is known as a *"brave homme,"* unpretentious, with no false modesty, with no extravagant ambitions, in no wise inclined to magnify his own importance nor yet that of his *rôle,* and he fulfils his mission without any great ardor, but with no over-worry. His ambition will be satisfied if he succeeds in reaching the legal limit of his magistracy without any too grave accidents to compromise the tranquillity of his country, and in handing on to his successor a France more or less mistress of its destinies.

I have said that I did not mean to predict the future. I am not a chiromantist. I am simply noting here the existence of an evil extremely rife in France, which exists as well throughout Europe to a greater or less degree—namely, the growing evil everywhere of social parasitism, which it will be the mission of the twentieth century to combat, to repress and to extirpate.

When the fruit appears on the branches it is almost imperceptible; its progress is slow, for the sap ascends slowly from the soil, and slowly the warmth descends from the sky, combining their forces for the ripening thereof. It takes on its peculiar hue; its lines swell until it reaches its perfect form; it grows and thrives until now only the last drop of sap is wanting to give it its final beauty, its firm texture and its sweet savor. Then, lo! of a sudden it falls from the tree, just at this supremely critical psychological moment preceding its complete maturity. It falls, it remains inert. It has the appearance of fruit; it contains all the essential elements. But it is dead-sea fruit.

Now, alongside the idle and the drones, who have enough to live upon, but who are able to add nothing to their resources, side by side with the twining parasite who climbs up along the social organism, catching in all the interstices of the trellis, and insinuating itself into every depression, where it thrives on the blood and flesh of others, there is also the *fruit sec,* the *poseur,* the man

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

who has vague ideas on every subject, the man who cherishes every ambition and appetite and aspiration, the man of universal pretensions, who is always ready with an explanation, always ready to redress everthing, and who fancies he has the right to occupy every place and to play any rôle he may fancy.

These three negative social types, the shiftless and idle, the parasite, and the dead-sea fruit, taken together, form the evil which is obstructing the normal social life of France.

And this malady must be eliminated by France, and by all Europe, if France and Europe, which are suffering diversely therefrom, would escape perdition. The mission of France in the twentieth century will be the extirpation of this triple parasitism, and the substitution of live flesh for the dead flesh which now encumbers its movements. To be sure, neither France nor Europe has as yet reached the point at which either is liable immediately to succumb to this malady which is gnawing at their vitals. Its action is long and slow; and the energy displayed by the nations in their struggle against the elements of disintegration is often of the utmost vigor. But those nations that have not a clear perception of the malady are exposed to more painful surprises still, to more speedy destruction, when the hour strikes at which they will be perforce constrained to cast about for some radical means of cure or perish in their nonchalance and ignorance.

In my opinion, the problem of the suppression of this malady of social parasitism is to-day the most pressing and serious one with which the century now opening will have to deal. And that century cannot dream of outstripping in grandeur the age now gone, which has been the greatest that has ever existed, and which none no doubt will ever surpass.

The eighteenth century at its setting, if I may so express myself, lighted by the explosion of the French Revolution the aurora of human liberty, of the enfranchised conscience, of budding legality. The nineteenth century awoke amidst the hubbub of war. Cries went up from Saragossa against the violation of territory. The lurid lights of Moscow gleamed over the sinister horrors of invasion, and when the Colossus fell, when on his frail bark he sailed toward his eternal rock, one might have believed that the era of wars was forever ended. France, too, should have been cured of war, for, after twenty years of fighting and torment,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

saturated with glory, but thirsting for repose, she rejoiced in the recovery of her old frontiers. Yet the most pacific of monarchies again made war, and it was to her that was due the destruction of the triple-state of the Mediterranean pirates.

It was then that humanity resolved to eradicate the greatest of its shames, namely slavery; and it will be the crowning glory of the nineteenth century that it undertook this task and succeeded therein. But in the domain of politics, in the domain of science, in the field of inventions, the nineteenth century has been, I repeat, the greatest of all. It has witnessed the unification of Germany, as a consequence of a long premeditated war, which, all other considerations aside, was tarnished by the unjust aggression upon Lorraine. It has witnessed the unification of Italy, obtained by methods as ingenious as they were unforeseen; and it has beheld with astonished eyes, looming once more over the world, the vague image of the ancient Rome. Most extraordinary of visions, within sixteen years—the space of an atom in the duration of existence as a whole—it has almost beheld the realization of the terrible sentence which predicted and explains the action of Italian unity: "My kingdom is not of this world." Yes, between the day when Pius IX., whose sovereignty extended from Rome to Ferrara, from Ferrara to Ancone; who had at his disposal cities and ports, spiritual armies and a tangible living one; who could strike with the sword and excommunicate with a word; who, from the highest summits of Papal temporal and spiritual power, had proclaimed the dogma of the Immaculate Conception; between the day, I say, of this proclamation and the day when the Italian guns battered down the Porta Pia, within this ephemeral space of time the royal Papacy had become a thing of the past, and Pius IX. was a prisoner in the Vatican.

Such are the two vast achievements, the two incredible and unhoped for unifications, realized by this nineteenth century in the domain of international politics.

But it has done more than this. At the gesture of Stanley, who dispelled before him as he advanced the thick shadows which enswathed the Dark Continent, it replied by a veritable and multiple invasion of that continent; and to-day, what with the enterprise, energy and activity of the nineteenth century, the black world of Africa has ceased to present its impenetrable secrets to the inflexible spirit of investigation of our time.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But the new century will have to continue and complete the inquiries of the old one, to consolidate its work, and to shed yet more light across the still obscure portions of the realms already discovered, but not yet sufficiently opened up.

I catch glimpses, however, in the twentieth century of wars on wars throughout its entire span. If the United States is swept away by the wind of imperialism, it must make ready to sustain during the coming century formidable struggles, in order to assimilate what is still wanting to the satisfaction of its imperialist dreams, and no time should be lost in the preparation of the means which will permit the serious realization of this ideal.

England, little by little, has succumbed to the fascination exercised on nations as well as men by the mirage of conquests and aggrandizement. Its domain is immense. To insure its safety, it will have formidably to increase its means of protection at home. While striving to attach to itself its empire by the free sympathy of its allied colonies, it must put itself in readiness to succor them in order to be succored by them. Their attachment must be secured by a sense of the security which the mother country affords them; and within her own borders, too, she should see to it that she is safe against all surprise. By raising the prestige of her armies, she must learn to inspire fear in her foes and confidence in her partisans. Without pretending to foresee from what direction war will come, what is certain is that the logic and force of circumstances will impel her to reorganize her army.

I should like to read the intimate thoughts of those who took part in the inter-parliamentary congress of peace during the Paris Exhibition. Are there really any among them who believe that the era of wars can so soon be closed, or, in fact, can ever be ended? Struggle is the very evidence, the very manifestation of life, the stimulant of the race, and the cessation of combat is the cessation of life. For my part, I believe that the twentieth century will witness numerous and terrible wars throughout the entire globe. In the centre of Europe I see war break out on the morrow of the death of Francis Joseph.

There is not a single reflecting being who can suppose that, at Francis Joseph's death, the marvellous mosaic, which from the Austria of yesterday has become the Austria-Hungary of to-day, will continue to remain what it now is. With the disappearance of the direct heir to the throne vanished all possibility of a peace-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

able succession; and, most extraordinary of all, by imposing upon François d'Este, the present heir, a solemn oath renouncing for his descendants all rights to the succession, the Austro-Hungarian monarchy has deprived the successor of Francis Joseph of still another chance of reigning, for it has reduced to his existence alone the duration of his succession. Just how the war which will follow Francis Joseph's death will occur, it is impossible to foresee, for the very reason that it is inevitable, and any and every circumstance may light the spark. But that it will break out is certain, for Roumania, encouraged by Russia, will wish to seize Transylvania from Hungary, which Hungary in turn never will give up. It will break out, because the Slav countries, also encouraged by Russia, will refuse both to live under the shadow of the Hungarians and under the shadow of the Germans. It will break out because neither Russia nor France, nor the other Powers, will ever peaceably suffer Germany to be augmented by the six millions of Germans in Austria. It will break out because Bosnia and Herzegovina will find themselves coveted by Montenegro, Bulgaria, Servia and Slav Croatia. It will break out because Italy will dream of extending its territory from Trieste to Cattaro and of recovering its Adriatic coasts, of which it possesses to-day the immortal and ever-glorious queen, Venice.

It will break out, and if arbitration were not a mad chimera, it would be indeed a case in which to apply it, this death of Francis Joseph; since no one would venture to have recourse previously to the solution of the assembling of a vast European congress.

As for Germany, the task incumbent upon her during the coming century is to transform its union into a real unity, and to complete itself imperially by the incorporation of those six millions of Austrian Germans who will make her the most formidable nation in Europe. If to her material power be added her ingrained national obstinacy, the facility with which she changes her skies and acclimates herself in new air, her slow but sure and hard-working temper, and her ambition to keep what she has won, it will be understood that she is destined in the twentieth century to constitute the most absolute force in Continental Europe. This immense material force was prepared by Prince Bismarck, the giant of diplomacy to whom she owes all that she is to-day. But, to be just, we should admit that his disappearance was a tangible benefit for Germany, for it restored

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to that nation the moral strength and the natural uprightness which distinguished it before him. Prince Bismarck, to whom the German nation owes everlasting admiration and gratitude, did not sufficiently, during the thirty years in which he fashioned in his own way the spirit of all Germans, Prussians or no, hesitate as to the means, in attaining his ends. The truth he scorned, and when he pretended to tell the truth it was because he counted on the incredulity of the world, which thus protected him against the consequences of a calculated and deceptive frankness. But so vast was his influence on the nation that, beholding him, as it did, so cleverly capable of mixing up truth and falsehood, it lost something of that intellectual probity known as "heaviness of wit;" and Bismarck disappeared just at the right moment for his baneful influence to suffer a check.

William II. has not continued the arrogant and underhanded policy of the Chancellor. He has not given his nation the example of a duplicity raised to the dignity of a principle. He is a man of violent impulses, of lofty temper, superior to all ordinary concessions, although, to be sure, maintaining always one foot well planted on the earth, a man whose forehead is lighted by ardent convictions and who loses himself in images. He, too, teaches the nation of which he is the head the disdain of others; but his teaching is more elevated, of a finer quality, more worthy of the destiny toward which he thinks to lead it. Thus far, it should be said, William II. has been content with little. He has, nevertheless, effaced the acute antipathy so bitterly felt here and there toward the German nation. To-day, Germany is respected. It weighs a good deal in the human scales. No one would venture to insult it, but it inspires no immediate apprehension. No one looks to see it appearing at a moment's notice on the battlefield where are to be determined for all time the destinies of Europe. William II. has by himself tempered the anger of Germany's enemies, and moderated their impatience. But he feels well enough that, were he to disappear to-day, he would not have justified the imperious action which upset the omnipotent Chancellor. He feels that he would leave behind him merely the memory of an impetuous personality, always seeking to keep himself well in view before the footlights, and dreading most of all even the passing eclipse of his name. During the coming century the young sovereign's rôle will become quite different and more

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

marked. And in the more or less general conflict of which I catch glimpses, his part will not be one of the least preponderant.

Young, too, is the sovereign whom an inexcusable, pitiless and objectless crime has just elevated to the throne of Italy. He, too, in the military drama of the twentieth century, will be called upon to play the brilliant rôle that devolves upon those who, seated upon a throne, are solicited by the growing ambition of their nations.

And, finally, in the midst of this explosion which is to resound throughout the opening years of the century, what will be the rôle of France? Will she confine her activity to the task of seeking to cure the internal ills which menace and devour her; or will she, too, in the vast *mêlée* of covetous ambitions, seek to recover her lost frontiers, or undertake to secure for herself, by compensations which it would be rash to define, fresh boundaries? Undoubtedly, a French diplomacy, far reaching in its views and quick to act, might even now prepare to cope with the problem of divisions of European soil during the next century. But you cannot expect this of a diplomacy which is constantly obliged to defend itself, and whose activity is thereby constantly enfeebled. The utility for France of the alliance with Russia is that it protects her against self-distrust. It releases her from a solitude which, for an impulsive nation, constitutes a real danger. It allows her to discuss matters more calmly after they have been well matured, and after she has had the benefit of advice tempering her own impetuosity. But, quite apart from this advantage accruing from the alliance, she will certainly, I am sure, find therein a positive assistance against that social parasitism which she is aware is invading her, for the alliance will afford her the one indispensable auxiliary to all reforms, namely, time.

For a long time I was resolutely opposed to the establishment in France of an income tax, but ever since I have been haunted by the necessity of dealing with this great national malady of parasitism—of diking in these moving sands which are, little by little, obstructing the access to all the refuges of the nation—my opinion has changed. But my notion of the application of this tax is a peculiar one. I look upon it for France, and indeed for any other country where the necessity may arise, as a means of palliating the evil upon which I have insisted. The tax, in my opinion, should fall as heavily as may be on the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

national parasitism. But it should in no wise be employed to diminish in any way the present tax; for the law of labor is the supreme, the universal law, the real law of a democracy, the condition of salvation for the Republic. The free citizens of the United States, which is the highest exemplar of a republican state, are giving to all republics, present and to come, the example of a pervasive and unremitting activity, of common labor, in the spirit of a common obligation. For me, therefore, an income tax should exist in addition to the normal budget, and the enormous resources thus obtained should be put aside and utilized for premiums on emigration for any Frenchman wishing to settle in the colonies, and giving satisfactory guarantees of his capacity to make proper use of the money which will be advanced him. My object would thus be that national parasitism be obliged to bear its responsibility both at home and abroad; for it is the grand law of universal labor which the next century, I hold, will render paramount. Science and discoveries have provided it with the most effective means of getting the most out of labor, and of extirpating the universal parasitism which is the greatest plague and menace of the human race. Parasitism engenders the calculated sterility of woman, which, in its turn, is the creator of parasitism; for it affords to the rare offspring that are born the means of living without work, and thus it menaces the stability of institutions, peace between men and that dignity which is the greatest safeguard of human honor and independence. For humanity to progress in the coming century, and to continue its onward march toward the supreme ideal of creation, this parasitism, which is a challenge to human equity, must disappear; and the coming century, to which the nineteenth century has bequeathed the marvellous outfit of its inventions and devices, must be above all and everywhere the age of universal toil. This will prevent neither the struggle among men, nor war, nor conquest, nor hatred; but it will call a halt to the shames and stupidities of the present hour, and prevent here or elsewhere the gangrene from spreading in social organism, and the advance of universal existence toward the eternal tomb.

I lay down my pen here, for, after all, I must fix a limit to this essay. Yet scarcely have I given a glimpse of the problems to come which haunt every thinking brain whenever it lets its thoughts play freely in observation and reflection. I have the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

presentiment, if not the absolute certainty, that the nineteenth century has been but the preface of the solutions which are to be the privilege of its successor. My conviction is that there is a force, whose real scope and power remains unsuspected by men, for it is as yet hardly wrested from the enigmatic obscurity in which it lurks. I refer to electricity. It is my conviction that the task of revealing the full meaning of this demiurgic force is to devolve upon the twentieth century, and that then, the question solved, the entire problem of existence on this globe will be seen to have been solved as well. The solution of all the problems which are tormenting the human mind is bound up in this one. This solution will suppress frontiers, change the aims of armies, subject the planetary spaces to the human will, modify altogether the faith of the race, and give in general to the efforts of its intelligence a fresh direction and an object as yet undreamed of.

It is the progress of the power of electricity which is destined to offer to the human race the penultimate word on the everlasting enigma which it has sought to solve, ever since the problem and mystery of human destinies have been its torment.

H. G. DE BLOWITZ.

Postscript:

Some of my readers may have been asking themselves why in my appreciations as to the future of certain states I have passed over in silence the fate of Russia. This is because the future of that state escapes every law of logic. That empire is the product of a single brain and a single will, and it remains to-day, as at its origin, subject to individual action, to a single predominant authority. Violence alone can alter this situation, and what will then ensue staggers thought. Besides this, only the will of the Czars, expressed in the most astonishing and unexpected way, can effect a change. In all likelihood, it is the latter hypothesis which will be realized. Russia has had a Czar Creator; it has had a Czar Emancipator; it will have a Czar Liberator. But in determining the drift of its future, logic can play no rôle; it cannot pretend to prophesy.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE FOOD OF THE ARMY DURING THE SPANISH WAR.*

BY R. A. ALGER, FORMERLY UNITED STATES SECRETARY OF WAR.

THE Commission appointed by the President at my request to investigate the conduct of the War Department in the war with Spain, commonly known as the War Investigation or the Dodge Commission, met on the 24th day of September, 1898. Up to the 21st of December, 1898, this Commission had taken testimony in seventeen towns and cities and in many different camps, granting, wherever it went, to the citizens, soldiers, or ex-soldiers, an opportunity to appear for complaint or testimony of any kind regarding the conduct of the war. The Commission visited numerous camps in which there still were many thousands of soldiers, both regulars and volunteers, who were invited to give their evidence without regard to rank or service. On the 21st of December, the Major-General Commanding the Army of the United States appeared before the Commission, then sitting in Washington, and made his statements with respect to the canned fresh and refrigerated beef furnished to the army during the war. General Miles refused to be sworn or affirmed, as every other of the 495 witnesses had been, declaring in substance that he would "make his statements without being sworn and was responsible for what he said."

Although the Commission had been sitting nearly three months, the charges with respect to canned and refrigerated beef were now made for the first time; and, stranger and more inexcusable and more unsoldierly still, during all those months, with this pretended knowledge of facts which, if they existed, should have been made known to the Secretary of War, for the protection of the army—General Miles never mentioned the subject. Nor did I ever hear a rumor of chemically treated beef being purchased

* This article forms the substance of the twenty-second chapter of General Alger's forthcoming book on "The Spanish-American War."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for the army until the General's testimony was given before the Commission. These allegations are as follows:

"Capt. Howell: 'I want to ask you, General, is that canned beef a part of the ration?'

"General Miles: 'It was made part of the ration during this war, to the extent of sending to Porto Rico, as I say, nearly 200,000 pounds of it.'

"Q. 'I mean by that, was it fixed by Congress as a part of the army ration?'

"A. 'No, sir.'

"Q. 'Who fixed it, then, as a part of the army ration?'

"A. 'You will have to ask some one here in Washington.'

"Q. 'I want to know how it became part of the army ration. If he does not know, who should' (referring to General Miles)?

"A. 'You had better ask the Secretary of War or the Commissary General; I think they can tell you. I know it was sent to the army as food, and the pretense is that it was sent as an experiment. . . . . There was sent to Porto Rico 337 tons of what is known as, or called, refrigerated beef, which you might call embalmed beef. . . . . Now, if you want to ascertain the cost to the Government of this so-called refrigerated beef—embalmed beef—take the original cost. . . . . I do not know what may have been injected into it. . . . . The understanding is that this is a secret process of preserving beef. . . . . It may be that they are still sending the stuff down there. I don't know. . . . . If I was furnished for any expedition in this country, or any other, with such stuff, I would prohibit the men from taking it. . . . . I do not think that beef such as was sent to Cuba and Porto Rico would be good in any country in the stomach of any man. . . . . They could get some bacon, but that is not considered suitable food for the Tropics. . . . . You ask about food. In my judgment that was one of the serious causes of so much sickness and distress on the part of our troops.'"

Not content with these grave and scandalous charges, thus made public for the first time before the War Investigating Commission, General Miles permitted himself to be interviewed on the following day, at Cincinnati, Ohio, when he made these charges:

"The part in my testimony of yesterday of 337 tons of refrigerated beef and 198,000 pounds of canned fresh beef, which was unfit for food, is only an item. This quantity was sent to one town in Porto Rico. How much more was sent I do not know. . . . . Yes; or it might do for one man to try it on his own stomach; but to feed an army, that was more than an experiment. . . . . As I stated in my testimony, I believe the action of these chemicals was largely responsible for the sickness in the army. I have medical authority for this statement, and believe it to be true."

General Miles was given an opportunity to officially deny this interview, but he did not do so. His written and official reply was evasive and equivocal. When he appeared before the Court of Inquiry he was unable to repudiate that interview under oath.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The allegations that unsuitable food, not a part of the legal ration, had been furnished to the army under pretense of an experiment, and that refrigerated beef, treated with poisonous chemicals, had been and was being supplied to our army of 275,000 men, were indeed serious, implying, as they did, criminal incompetency on the part of the Commissary Department, if not willful negligence and dishonesty.

Upon Commissary-General Charles P. Eagan the charges fell with the suddenness and sharpness of a blow from an assassin's knife out of the dark. General Eagan had been an officer of the regular army for thirty-six years. He had risen from a second-lieutenancy to the highest rank in the Commissary Department to which his ambition could aspire. Gallant and fearless on the battlefields of the Civil War and the hostile Indian plains of the West, he had a record for soldierly qualities of which any officer might well be proud. With energy, honesty and zeal, he had administered his Department during the war with Spain; a fitting climax to a long and honorable career in the service of his country.

No other supply bureau of the army had excelled the Commissary Department in promptness, efficiency, and successful administration during the war. I never entered the War Department, whether early in the day or late at night, and called for the Commissary-General that he did not report at once. I never gave him an order that was not immediately carried out to the letter. Indeed, his zeal and anxiety for the soldiers in camp and field were so great that his efforts in their behalf, during the long and weary days and nights of the hot summer, nearly resulted in his prostration from overwork. The charges of General Miles, made so publicly and so positively, and the manner in which they were for the first time made known, seemed to General Eagan, in his nervous condition, the more magnified and horrible. Upon hearing them, he pitifully exclaimed: "General Miles has crucified me upon a cross of falsehood and misrepresentation."

General Eagan had already been examined by the War Investigation Commission when General Miles's hearing occurred; but, when the testimony of the latter appeared in the newspapers, General Eagan immediately requested a rehearing. This was granted him on the 12th of January, 1899. After being sworn, General Eagan said:

"I desire to say here that the first intimation I ever had that this

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

beef was chemically treated beef, embalmed beef, was read by me in the newspapers as coming from the senior Major-General of the Army, Nelson A. Miles. When I read it I could not believe it. The statements in the newspapers were so utterly at variance with the truth that I expected to see an immediate denial from General Miles."

General Eagan read his reply to the War Investigation Commission from a carefully prepared typewritten manuscript. Lashed to the quick by the allegations contained in General Miles's testimony, and in his subsequent interview, which appeared on December 23d in a New York newspaper, his indignation exceeded the limits of his self-control, and in his efforts to deny the charges made, his language became vituperative, extravagant, and highly improper. I believe that, had General Eagan's health not been seriously impaired by overwork and anxiety, the two objectionable paragraphs—of 300 words, out of an aggregate of 12,000 words contained in his reply—would never have been written or uttered. Even yet, divested of its offensive adjectives in the two paragraphs referred to, his reply to General Miles remains unanswerable in its logic and incontrovertible in its facts.

The allegation that I had inspired or had any knowledge of General Eagan's intended attack upon the statement of General Miles, is absolutely untrue. He did not make known to me the nature of his proposed answer to the charges. Neither did he consult me in the matter. I never saw the reply, nor did I know its character until a copy of it was handed to me by a member of the press. Had General Eagan submitted his manuscript to me, he would undoubtedly at this writing still be in full possession of the rank and privileges of the office of Commissary-General of the United States Army. As it was, even the self-prejudicial and intemperate presentation made by General Eagan convinced the Commission that there was no foundation in fact for the charges and insinuations deducible from the terms "pretense of experiment" and "embalmed beef."

As soon as I learned of General Eagan's statement before the Commission, I sent for him. I informed him of my surprise and mortification at his conduct. "Why did you not permit your friends to read your testimony? Why did you not show it to me and thereby have prevented the disgrace that is now sure to come upon you and the uniform you wear? You had no right," I continued, "to make use of such unbridled language at a time and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

under circumstances which will assuredly result in associating the President's name and my own with such a disgraceful episode."

The language of General Eagan could not be overlooked. He was tried by court-martial for conduct unbecoming an officer and a gentleman, and for conduct to the prejudice of good order and military discipline; of these charges and specifications he was found guilty, and recommended to be dismissed from the service. The sentence of the Court, however, was commuted to suspension from rank and duty for six years until his retirement—"in view of his gallant conduct in battle upon more than one occasion, which merited and has received the warm commendation of his superiors, and of his long and honorable record of service, extending over a period surpassing in duration that usually allotted to a generation; having regard, also, to the mitigating circumstances which were developed during the trial of the case, and in deference to the recommendation of clemency submitted in his behalf."

The suspension of General Eagan from the functions of his office until his retirement, stripped the service of an honest and able officer. His court-martial was not the outcome of General Miles's charges, but the result of intemperate and unmilitary language, conceived in an indignation pardonable, perhaps, in its existence, but unpardonable in its mode of expression.

General Miles seemed to be pleased with the notoriety which his startling statements before the Commission and in his subsequent newspaper interview gave him; for again, on the 31st of March, 1899, in New York City, he published, through representatives of the Associated Press and of a metropolitan paper, additional charges. This interview, which appeared on the morning of February 1st, General Miles was called upon to deny under oath; and, as he was unable to do so, part of his statements in it were used by the Court of Inquiry as a basis for investigation. I quote two paragraphs proven to be part of the statements made by General Miles to the reporters:

"I have overwhelming evidence that the embalmed beef was treated with chemicals in order to preserve it. I have affidavits from men who saw the beef undergoing treatment or embalming process. . . . . Now, as to the canned roast beef, that was different from the embalmed beef. The canned roast beef was the beef after the extract had been boiled out of it. You have seen the advertisements 'Beef Extract, one pound contains the substance of from four to five pounds of prime beef.' Well,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

this is the beef after the extract has been taken from it. They put this beef pulp up in cans and labelled it 'canned roast beef.' The soldiers report that the canned beef was nauseating. If swallowed, it could not be kept on the stomach."

It is proposed to treat General Miles's allegations specifically and in detail. His charges with respect to canned roast beef were, that it was not a part of the army ration and (by inference) had been issued to the army by the Secretary of War and the Commissary-General without authority of law; and that it was the meat residue—a beef pulp which was left after the extract had been taken from it. With respect to refrigerated beef, he alleged that it was "embalmed beef," which had been artificially preserved by injecting chemicals into it; that he had overwhelming evidence that the "embalmed beef" was treated with chemicals to preserve it; and that the refrigerated beef would not be "good in any country in the stomach of any man."

He also said, generally, that bacon was not considered a suitable ration for the Tropics, and that the beef furnished the army was the cause of much sickness and distress; that it was largely responsible for the sickness in the army, and that he had medical authority for this statement.

General Miles should have known that neither the Secretary of War nor the Commissary-General could legally alter or add to the ration of the army. The ration is fixed by law, and its components can be changed only by the President of the United States. An examination of the records of the War Department, or inquiry of the Commissary-General, would have speedily developed the fact that canned fresh beef (or, as it is known, canned roast beef) had been a recognized part of the army ration for nearly a quarter of a century. If General Miles did not know that canned fresh beef was a part of the army ration, then he displayed an ignorance in an important matter of his profession that is, to say the least, most remarkable; if he did know that canned fresh beef was a recognized part of the ration, then his allegation to the contrary is so much more reprehensible.

On the 1st of August, 1878, canned fresh beef first became a part of the travel ration of the United States Army, then under the command of General Sherman, and while the Honorable George W. McCrary was Secretary of War. This fact was made known in a public order issued by the War Department:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Headquarters of the Army,
"Adjutant-General's Office,
"Washington, August 1, 1878.

"General Orders,
"No. 59.

"By direction of the Secretary of War the following order is published to the Army:

"I. The following issues may be made to troops travelling upon cars or transports, or in the field, when it is impracticable to cook their rations, viz: Seventy-five pounds of canned fresh or corned beef, and sixteen 3-pound cans or six 1-gallon cans of baked beans, or 15 pounds of cheese per hundred rations—the issues of canned beef to be in lieu of the meat, and the beans and cheese in lieu of the vegetable ration authorized by existing regulations and orders. None of the above-mentioned articles will be sold by companies or detachments as savings.

* * * * * * *

"By command of General Sherman:

"E. D. TOWNSEND, Adjutant-General."

Canned fresh beef was again specifically referred to in General Orders, under dates of November, 1879, of September 28, 1881, January 19, 1888, and February 8, 1888. The last mentioned order changed the Army Regulations and included in those regulations a reference to canned fresh beef:

"[General Orders, No. 8.]

"Headquarters of the Army,
"Adjutant-General's Office,
"Washington, February 8, 1888.

"By direction of the Secretary of War, paragraph 2150 of the Regulations is amended to read as follows:

"2150. A ration is the established daily allowance of food for one person. For the United States Army it is now composed as follows: Twelve ounces of pork or bacon or canned beef (fresh or corned), or 1 pound and 4 ounces of fresh beef, or 22 ounces of salt beef; 18 ounces of soft bread or flour, or 16 ounces of hard bread, or 1 pound and 4 ounces of corn meal. To every 100 rations, 15 pounds of beans or pease, or 10 pounds of rice or hominy; 10 pounds of green coffee, or 8 pounds of roasted (or roasted and ground) coffee, or 2 pounds of tea; 15 pounds of sugar; 4 quarts of vinegar; 1 pound and 8 ounces of adamantine or star candles; 4 pounds of soap; 4 pounds of salt; 4 ounces of pepper; and to troops in the field, when necessary, 4 pounds of yeast powder to the 100 rations of flour.

"By command of Lieutenant-General Sheridan:

"R. C. DRUM, Adjutant-General."

The allegations of General Miles, that canned fresh beef was not a part of the army ration and that it was issued as the "pretense of an experiment," were not only contrary to fact, but were made absolutely without a particle of evidence or excuse. If General Miles really believed his serious charges, his conduct is all the more blameworthy, in that he apparently made no effort to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

assure himself of their truthfulness, nor to report them to the Secretary of War before publicly uttering them.

If we are to believe written evidence to the contrary, it does not appear that General Miles was even honest in making his dilatory charges that the tinned beef was issued as the pretense of an experiment and that it was not a part of the ration. On the 17th of June, 1898, his most confidential staff officer signed a letter by "direction of the Major-General commanding the Army," instructing the Depot Commissary at Tampa to furnish to General Nunez 10,644 pounds of canned roast beef, to be issued from the "subsistence stores of the army." If we are to accept the reading of this letter as correct, it proves that General Miles knew that canned fresh beef was a part of the ration; that he knew there was a large quantity of it at Tampa for issue to the troops; and that he so far approved of its use as to direct that the ration be furnished in large quantities to our allies. The letter is as follows:

"Headquarters of the Army,
"Tampa, Fla., June 17th, 1898.

"Major A. L. Smith, Dept. Commissary, Tampa, Fla.—
"Sir:

"The Major-General commanding directs that you transfer to Gen. Nunez, of the Cuban Army, on board the steamer 'Florida,' at Port Tampa, for issue to the insurgent forces, the following subsistence stores:

48	barrels Pork	9,600 lbs.
336	crates Bacon	67,275 "
19	cases Beef, Canned, Boiled No. 4	456 "
37	" Beef, Canned, Roasted No. 6	444 "
406	" Beef, Canned, Roasted No. 2	9,744 "
159	barrels Corn Meal	31,164 "
189	sacks Beans (176 barrels.)	18,900 "
3	sacks Potatoes	48,760 "
22	" Green Coffee	3,330 "
24	" Sugar (issued)	2,400 "

"Yours very respectfully,
"F. MICHLER,
"Asst. Adjutant-Gen."

It was never intended by the Commissary Department that canned beef should be used other than as an emergency or travel ration. General Eagan's predecessors in office had, twenty years before the Spanish-American war, highly recommended its use, and it had been officially included in the regular travel ration. Canned fresh beef has, ever since the Civil War, been a part

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the regular navy ration, 500,000 pounds of this food having been used annually in our navy before the war with Spain. For years, large quantities of canned fresh beef have been shipped to the European armies, France alone purchasing 25,000,000 pounds of one firm in the United States, while Great Britain has secured from the same establishment, for her army and navy, no less than from ten to fifteen million pounds. With a legal warrant for its use, the approval of at least two previous Commissaries-General, its general use abroad, and its large consumption in our own navy, General Eagan was certainly fortified in his belief that it could be efficaciously used by our troops. Moreover, the present Commissary-General, then Colonel J. F. Weston, in a letter to General Eagan under date of March 24th, 1898, thus refers to canned fresh beef:

"The Armour Company is putting up a roast beef and boiled beef canned. It is from strips, and about what I wanted so far as process, but not so good, as it does not include the whole; still it is good. I have made hash, also stew, from it that was fit for the immortal gods and not beneath the notice of a general, using a little bacon, potatoes, onions, flour, and condiments; just what a soldier has. It makes a good, palatable, hearty meal, and I am entirely safe in saying that we, in this way, can furnish fresh beef to any number of men concentrated in Florida or Cuba at about 10.5 cts. per pound. It will not be steak, or choice roast; still it will be fresh beef. It can be furnished without loss, and that is more than can be said of cattle on the hoof or in refrigerator cars; it will be healthful, which is not the case if killed at once; a necessity if furnished on the hoof. To me it presents a solution of a difficult problem, a problem that must be met; there is no substitute."

Fresh canned beef was preferred over corned canned beef, because of the fact that the salt in the latter produced thirst—a decided objection in a tropical country; but the tinned beef should have been used only when cooked with vegetables and properly seasoned. In this statement lies the secret of the source of complaint against canned fresh beef. The only fault found with the ration was that it was unpalatable when served without additional cooking and without vegetables and condiments. The ration was not used to any great extent in the camps in the United States, but only on the transports to Cuba and Porto Rico, and for a short time in Cuba by part of Shafter's army in the trenches, where objection to its use could also be raised on account of the inability to cook and serve it suitably. A few issues were also made in Porto Rico. And yet, despite the improper preparation of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

food, owing to unavoidable circumstances resulting from military necessity, no complaints of its unpalatability reached the War Department. The Chief Commissary of the Shafter expedition testified under oath that, while he was in Cuba, he "never heard a single, solitary complaint." General Shafter testified to practically the same effect; and the chief surgeon of the Fifth Corps says that there did not come to him any complaint of the use of the tinned beef.

While General Miles's charges that canned fresh beef was not a part of the legal ration, and that it was furnished as a pretense of experiment, could be and were so easily disproven by records and incontrovertible facts—of which he could have readily been made cognizant, had he been as thorough in his prior investigations as he had been positive in his charges—his allegation that the meat was the "pulp" from which the extract of beef had been taken, while not believed, required painstaking and careful investigation. It was immediately determined that no expense or effort should be spared to ascertain the truth or falsity of this charge. The most expert and scientific men in the country were, therefore, employed by the Government to further the investigation—such physiological chemists as Professor R. H. Chittenden of Yale and Professor W. O. Atwater of Wesleyan University, as well as Dr. W. D. Bigelow, a chemist in the Bureau of Animal Industry in the Department of Agriculture.

The Court of Inquiry visited several of the large packing-houses accompanied by Dr. Bigelow. The results of personal examinations and of the investigations of the experts employed, conclusively showed that there was not one jot or tittle of evidence or excuse for the statement that canned fresh beef was the pulp after the beef extract had been removed. The methods obtaining in all packing-houses for the preparation of this product are practically the same. After passing an inspection by the officials of the Agricultural Department representing the Government at all of these establishments, the beef is cut up into small sections, boiled for fifteen or twenty minutes, placed in cans after the tendons and gristle have been cut away, sealed, subjected to a sterilization process under a temperature of 215 degrees to 225 degrees, Fahrenheit, for two or three hours, then punctured to allow the gas to escape, and again sealed. This process does not extract any of the nutritive or muscle-forming elements of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

meat, the only losses incurred in it being "water, fat, soluble ash, and meat bases. Of these the fat is useful in supplying fuel for body heat, and the meat bases have some value as a tonic."* Instead of being "pulp" or residuum of any character whatsoever, canned fresh beef is a concentrated product.

While General Miles's specifications did not include any statements regarding the use of preservatives in the tinned meat, a number of cans sent to Havana, Santiago and Porto Rico with the army were furnished by General Miles and carefully analyzed. No trace of any preservatives or chemicals were found in them.

The imputations with respect to canned fresh beef were most carefully and thoroughly examined and reported upon by two impartial tribunals, one being composed of eminent citizens, ex-soldiers, and a distinguished general officer of the regular army (I refer to the War Investigation Commission); the other, the Court of Inquiry, consisting wholly of officers of the regular army of high rank and unimpeachable integrity, especially assembled to investigate this question. There was no subject to which the Dodge Commission devoted more time or more thoroughly investigated than the assertions of the senior Major-General of the Army. This Commission personally visited many large camps and numerous cities, receiving and courting testimony on this important matter wherever they went. The Court of Inquiry was even more thorough in its research, its visits including the large packing-houses where the canned meat is prepared. What did these tribunals find? That there was no foundation for the charge that canned fresh beef was not a part of the ration, or that it had been furnished as the pretense of experiment, or that it was the pulp from beef.

The Court of Inquiry properly found that canned fresh beef was an unpalatable ration, without condiments, when not cooked and when not served with vegetables. In the haste under which the Santiago expedition left Tampa, proper provision for cooking the food of the men on the transports seems to have been either neglected or impossible, on account of the lack of time. General Miles arrived at Tampa on June 1st, for the purpose of rendering such assistance to the Commanding General of the Santiago expedition as his military experience and high rank could give.

*Report of Dr. W. D. Bigelow, Assistant Chemist, U. S. Department of Agriculture.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

He was the special representative of the War Department, delegated to overlook that expedition and assist in its preparation and embarkation. He remained at Tampa until June 15th, the day after the Fifth Corps sailed. During his stay at Tampa, there arrived there no less than twenty days' rations—for Shafter's army of 16,000—of canned fresh beef alone, or fifty carloads. If General Miles did not look into the question of food for the Santiago expedition; if he did not consult with the Commanding General of that expedition concerning the ration to be taken with the troops and its method of preparation; if he did not consult with the Chief Commissary of that expedition concerning this important feature of the campaign, he was as culpable as though he had failed to inspect all other important matters, such as ammunition, transportation, etc., and he must share whatever responsibility attached to the use of the canned fresh beef on the transports. There was no shortage in vegetables, since nearly 2,000,000 rations of potatoes, onions and canned tomatoes were shipped to Cuba with General Shafter's army; and, before the end of July, this supply had been increased to nearly 4,000,000 rations of vegetables. The unexpected delay of eight days on the transports off Tampa, resulting from the fright of the ghost fleet, prolonged the use of the canned beef on the transports and intensified the dislike for it, which was created by improper cooking facilities and lack of accessibility to the vegetables.

The use of the ration in the trenches before Santiago has never been fully explained. While only part of the army used canned fresh beef during the siege, it seems strange that any regimental commissary should have drawn it at Siboney if, after its use on the transports, the troops objected to it, and when there was plenty of bacon available. No less than 1,230,317 rations of bacon were at Siboney and on the transports off shore. The men in the trenches were confronted with the same unfavorable conditions which had already attended the use of the beef ration on the transports. It could not be properly cooked, and the difficulties of communication between Siboney and the Santiago trenches made it impossible to transport any large quantities of vegetables before July 17th.

Besides finding that canned fresh beef was unsuitable when not cooked with vegetables, the Court of Inquiry also expressed the opinion that the purchase of 7,000,000 rations by the Com-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

missary-General, during the first two months of the war with Spain, was a "colossal error for which there is no palliation." This, of course, is a question for judgment as between the Court of Inquiry and General Eagan. The latter has stated, however, that 7,000,000 rations would provision a force of 257,000 men for which it was purchased for only 25 5-11 days. No canned fresh beef was purchased after June. The entire force of the army was intended to be used in active military operations, its disposal to depend on the development of the war. It was expected that at least a large portion of this force would constitute armies of invasion. Under these conditions, travel rations must be provided. The Commissary-General was by law confined to canned fresh beef or corned beef as the meat component to the travel ration. At the time this quantity of canned fresh beef was purchased, the investment of Havana by an army of 70,000 was in contemplation, besides expeditions to the south coast of Cuba, to Porto Rico, and to the Philippines. It was also proposed to open up communication with the insurgent army, then estimated at 100,000, and to feed them, as well as the thousands of Cuban reconcentrados, whose numbers were at that time greatly overestimated. The ration was not a perishable article, and I do not think that the expression, "colossal error," as applied to this purchase, was warranted. Moreover, the Navy Department, for its force of 13,121 officers and men, prior to the war, purchased annually 500,000 pounds, or 667,000 rations, of this same canned beef. This would be at the rate of 14,000,000 rations a year for a naval force the size of the army during the war. Again, the War Department is now sending to the Philippines 160,000 rations of canned fresh beef a month, for a force something less than 70,000! This is at the rate of approximately 2,000,000 rations a year for a force about one-fourth the size of the army for which General Egan provided 7,000,000 rations during the war with Spain, when he expected to feed, and did feed, also our Cuban allies, besides many starving Cuban reconcentrados. That the war was fought out in an unexpectedly short time should not be charged up against General Eagan's forehandedness, especially since nearly all of the canned beef purchased by him has been consumed by the army.*

* Some was distributed to the destitute Cubans. A few cans were spoiled as a result of being punctured and letting in air, less than ½ of 1 per cent. in all.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

General Miles's charges with respect to refrigerated beef were much more serious than his imputations regarding canned beef. His allegations, in substance, were that the beef furnished the army had been artificially preserved by injecting into it chemicals which were injurious to health; that he had overwhelming proof that this "embalmed beef" had been treated with chemicals; and that the refrigerated beef, such as was furnished our army, would not be "good in any country in the stomach of any man." It is significant to observe, at the outset, that the War Investigation Commission says: "Of the witnesses examined by this Commission, General Miles and Dr. Daly are the only ones who make this charge" of chemically treated beef. Astounding as this statement may seem, General Miles did not base his allegations upon personal experience or submit any proof in support of them. His startling and scandalous accusations appear to have been based entirely upon the verbal statements of Dr. W. H. Daly, a volunteer major and surgeon upon his staff during the war with Spain, and upon a single letter subsequently sent him by this volunteer. This letter is as follows:

"Washington, D. C., *September 21, 1898.

"The Assistant Adjutant-General,

"Headquarters of the Army, Washington, D. C.:

"Sir: I have the honor to report, in the interest of the service, that in the several inspections I made in the various camps and troopships at Tampa, Jacksonville, Chickamauga, and Porto Rico, that I found the fresh beef to be apparently preserved with secret chemicals, which destroys its natural flavor, and which I also believe to be detrimental to the health of the troops.

"While on duty at headquarters of the army at Tampa at the time of the embarkation of the 'Shafter expedition,' Colonel Weston, the efficient chief commissary, showed me a quarter of beef that had already, as a test, been sixty hours in the sun without being perceptibly tainted, so far as the sense of smell could detect.

"It is impossible to keep fresh beef so long untainted in the sun in that climate without the use of deleterious preservatives, such as boric acid, salicylic acid, or nitrate potash, injected into it in quantities liable to be hurtful to the health of the consumer.

"At Ponce, Porto Rico, much of the beef I examined arriving on the transports from the United States was also of the same character, being apparently preserved by injecting chemicals to aid deficient cold storage.

"Where efficient cold storage is impossible transporting beef alive is the method that should receive the fullest consideration by the Government as being safest for the health of the consumer. When detailed

* Dr. Daly claimed in his evidence before the War Investigation Commission that this letter should have been dated October 21.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to take charge of the transport 'Panama,' for conveying convalescents to the United States, I obtained 2,000 pounds of fresh beef from the commissary at Ponce. It looked well, but had an odor similar to that of a dead human body after being injected with preservatives, and it tasted when first cooked like decomposed boric acid, while, after standing a day for further inspection, it became so bitter, nauseous, and unpalatable as to be quite impossible for use. I was therefore obliged, owing to its condition, and the just complaints of the sick about it, and the disgustingly sickening odor it emitted when being cooked, and its mawkish, flat taste when served, and the safety of my patients—255 convalescent soldiers on board—to organize a board of survey, condemn and throw 1,500 pounds, all we had, overboard; consequently the convalescents were entirely without much-needed fresh beef, making the duty of bringing the men to the United States in an improved condition a very difficult matter.

"In my inspection of the Fourth United States Volunteer Infantry at Jacksonville recently I observed the same odor and taste upon the fresh beef, but not so marked, and at camp of Sixth United States Volunteer Infantry at Chickamauga I also, at several inspections, observed it markedly. I there inspected a lot of beef just issued to that regiment, and, while it looked well, was of a sickening odor, like a human body dead of disease and injected with preservatives, and when cooked was quite unpalatable, consequently likely to prove an efficient cause of ill health. The men complained of its insipid and mawkish flavor that high seasoning could not conceal.

"Believing that the Commissary Department has been imposed upon by the misdirected commercial spirit of persons furnishing beef, I respectfully recommend that the matter be investigated by experts making a quantitative and qualitative chemical analysis of the several preservatives suspected to be used by getting samples of beef furnished for export to Cuba and Porto Rico.

"If the question arises that a report should have been made by me earlier, I beg to say that I have endeavored, with all my opportunities, to first inform myself, by observation, of the conditions above noted sufficiently to warrant my drawing the attention of the Adjutant-General at Headquarters of the Army to the matter.

"Very respectfully, "W. H. DALY,
"Major and Chief Surgeon, U. S. Volunteers."

The processed beef at Tampa exhibited by a Mr. Powell, referred to in Dr. Daly's letter, was brought to Tampa by the inventor of the method by which it was treated, on his own responsibility and at his own expense. Neither the process nor the meat he furnished, nor the inventor, Mr. Powell himself, bore any relation to the contractors who supplied the army with beef, then or since. The inventor requested permission to exhibit his artificially preserved beef, and was allowed to do so in his private capacity. He requested and received permission to put two quarters of his own beef on one of the transports. It spoiled when at sea a few days later, and was thrown overboard. None of it

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was ever issued to the troops. Mr. Powell never again approached the Government in the matter, and he has stated under oath that his secret process was neither used then nor since by the contractors who furnished refrigerated beef to the army. Upon this single exhibit, his individual experience in eating some of this meat at Tampa and some refrigerated beef in Porto Rico, and upon the alleged chemical tests made by himself of meat claimed to be refrigerated beef, this volunteer doctor based his opinions and his evidence. Dr. Daly's "observations," as he terms these experiences, at Tampa, in Porto Rico, and subsequently at several of the camps in the United States, were confined almost exclusively to his sense of smell and taste—especially the latter. In his testimony before the Dodge Commission, he stated that he took some of the meat treated by the Powell process, cooked and ate it; that he afterwards became sick and had a taste in his mouth similar to that experienced when, on a hunting trip out West, he had eaten some antelopes and elk treated with boric and salicylic acids. He also claimed to have experienced the same taste when he ate some of the refrigerated beef in Porto Rico. This led him to infer that the Powell meat, and also the refrigerated beef in Porto Rico, had been treated with the same chemicals as the antelope and elk meat already mentioned. As a matter of fact, the inventor of the Powell process of treating meat swore that the beef exhibited by him at Tampa and eaten by Dr. Daly was treated by fumigation, and that neither boric nor salicylic acid was used at all in the operation. Dr. Daly made himself further ridiculous, in his letter to General Miles, by referring to the taste and smell of decomposed boric acid in the meat condemned by the Board on the "Panama." Scientific evidence was submitted to the effect that boric acid does not decompose when used as a meat preservative, and that it has neither taste nor odor.

The beef placed on board the "Panama" had been taken from a refrigerator ship, removed to the shore, kept there several days, and then put on the "Panama" with some native Porto Rican beef. Proper care had not been used to protect this meat from spoiling, and when, several days out from Ponce, the beef became bad, a Board of Survey condemned 963 pounds (not 1,500 pounds, as claimed by Dr. Daly). The Board of Survey, consisting of three officers, one of whom was a surgeon of the regular army,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

reported simply that the beef was "rotten and unfit for use," and that it was "not in prime condition when received in the hurry of leaving Ponce." Dr. Daly approved the proceedings of the Board and directed "that the tainted meat be at once thrown overboard." No mention is made in this Board's report of any suspected treatment with chemicals, and Dr. Daly does not refer to it in his endorsement on the Board's report. Without consulting any of his brother officers, or making known to them his suspicions that the beef had been chemically treated, he claims to have taken two samples of the meat from a kettle in which some beef was cooking on the ship, and, upon his return to the United States, to have made a chemical analysis thereof, and to have discovered traces of boric and salicylic acids. But he could establish no connection between the material which, he alleges, contained these acids and the refrigerated beef furnished by the contractors. As soon as this volunteer doctor offered his testimony, the War Investigation Commission sent telegraphic instructions to Cuba, Porto Rico and several places in the United States for samples of refrigerated beef then in the hands of the troops, and furnished by the same contractors who had supplied all the beef during the war. These samples were sealed in jars, brought to the United States and tested by expert chemists. Of the twenty-nine samples thus secured and analyzed, not one developed the presence of so much as a trace of boric, or salicylic, or any other acids or adulterants. They were all pure beef.

Dr. Daly also claimed, in the course of his testimony before the Dodge Commission, that he repeatedly tested (only by his two senses already referred to) the refrigerated beef at some of the camps of Porto Rico, and that he got the "same taste." Yet Colonel Huidekoper, a surgeon upon General Miles's staff, who made repeated observations of the troops, their camps, and the food used in Porto Rico, testified that he found no complaint regarding the meat; and he visited the camps in Porto Rico at practically the same time as Dr. Daly did. Dr. Daly also alleged that the beef at Chickamauga was apparently artificially preserved. The records show that 5,100,000 pounds of refrigerated beef were supplied to the troops at Chickamauga during the war with Spain. Not a single complaint was ever made regarding the beef furnished, either to General Brooke or to General Breckinridge, or to any person whomsoever. Indeed, Dr. Daly was the only witness

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

who ever testified that refrigerated beef was artificially preserved with chemicals, or "doctored" at all; and General Miles's allegations seem to have been based entirely upon the flimsy experience of this volunteer officer's defective taste and his highly questionable "observations" on the "Panama." At the time the "Panama" incident occurred, Dr. Daly himself admits that his observations had been in progress for three months. He did not communicate his suspicions to the Board which condemned and threw overboard the spoiled meat, which he claims to have suspected of being treated with chemicals, although the opportunity was an excellent one to have conclusively proven either the truth or error of his opinion. Neither did he submit his alleged samples of that meat to the Government experts and chemists for examination and test, but secretly took them to his home, and made an analysis himself, to which he did not even refer in his official report on this matter to General Miles. He did bring to Washington a residue claimed to have been taken from the "Panama," but not proven to be refrigerated beef, which contained traces of boric and salicylic acids. The circumstance is suspicious, and does not reflect credit upon General Miles's only witness.

The War Investigation Commission thus reported:

"The Commission is of the opinion that no refrigerated beef furnished by contractors, and issued to the troops during the war with Spain, was subjected to or treated with any chemicals by the contractors or those in their employ."

The Court of Inquiry went even further, and stated:

"The Board has recorded its opinion that the refrigerated beef, furnished under contracts for the use of the armies, was not 'doctored' or treated with any other agent than cold air. If any such treatment had been applied, it is the opinion of the Court that a knowledge of it could not have been concealed from the Commissary-General and his officers."

Again it says:

"The use of refrigerated beef on shore, after the troops had secured convenient harbors and landing facilities, was wise and desirable. The Court believes that there was no better food available or practicable."

With reference to General Miles's general charges that bacon was "not considered a suitable food for the tropics," and that the food furnished was the cause of the sickness in the army, little need be said with respect to bacon other than that it now continues to form one of the principal components of the ration furnished to the troops serving in the tropics and in Cuba.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The allegation that the food furnished the army was the cause of much sickness, seems to have been as little investigated or to have had as little warrant for its utterance as the other disproved charges. Although on the transports for fourteen days, during which time canned fresh beef was the principal meat ration, the Shafter expedition of nearly 17,000 men landed in Cuba with only 150 sick. It is the concurrent testimony of every officer, that the army landed in Cuba in excellent condition, notwithstanding the heat and confinement on the transports. It was not until August 1st, fifty-three days after the Fifth Corps had embarked at Tampa, that sickness became alarming; and then the causes of that sickness were indisputably traced to the climate and the diseases indigenous to the tropics. Kent's division of 4,442, on the 10th day of July, had but 214 sick, and five days afterwards this had fallen off to 200; and when the sickness in Shafter's army grew to such proportions as to cause concern, Lawton's division, which had subsisted almost entirely on bacon as the meat component of its ration, had the same percentage of sickness as Kent's division, which had subsisted almost entirely on canned fresh beef. The First Volunteer Cavalry had had little canned beef in Cuba, and yet its sick rate was practically the same as Kent's and Lawton's divisions. Moreover, we have already seen from General Wood's statement, which is supported by the records of the War Department, that every regiment that came to Santiago after the war, even when provided with floored tents and boiled water, had practically the same amount of sickness as Shafter's army. There was no evidence to support General Miles's statement that the food caused the sickness, but there was and is incontrovertible evidence to disprove it.

In matters of professional detail, the President and the Secretary of War must of necessity rely upon the Major-General commanding the Army, the Adjutant-General, the Inspector-General, and the other Bureau chiefs. But it is the especial duty of the Inspector-General's department to discover and report upon:

"All that pertains to the efficiency of the Army, the condition and state of supplies of all kinds, of arms, equipments, etc., etc., and report with strict impartiality in regard to all irregularities that may be discovered. From time to time they will make such suggestions as may appear to them practicable for the cure of any defects that may come under their observation."

The Inspector-General of the Army was with General Shafter's

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

corps at Tampa; he accompanied that expedition to Cuba; he was at the front during the entire period occupied by that army in the trenches; and, finally, he was, from August 2d until the abandonment of that camp, in command of the army and camp at Chickamauga. Tampa, the transports to Cuba, the trenches before Santiago, and Chickamauga were designated by General Miles as the particular places where bad beef, both canned and refrigerated, was issued. And yet on the first of November, 1898, the Inspector-General made no mention in his official annual report of any complaints against either canned or refrigerated beef, but specifically stated: "The Commissary Department has conducted its business, so far as I have been able to observe, in a most satisfactory manner in this war;" and again: "The quality of the food furnished is generally reported excellent, and there has been no complaint as to the quantity."

The army had won its battles in Cuba and the Philippines; Porto Rico had peacefully come into our hands after a few skirmishes; the protocol had been in operation for over four months, and even the Treaty of Peace had been signed at Paris. Then comes the Major-General commanding the Army of the United States with his charges. While the allegations of General Miles were not based upon fact, and were conclusively disproven by two separate tribunals, unimpeachable in their composition and methods of investigation, the irreparable damage had been done. A brave, honest, and faithful officer, suffering under the lash of such cruel, unwarranted and unjustified imputations, while exonerated from the heavy odium of those charges, was, as a result of them, sacrificed on the altar of his own passion, righteous in its existence but inexcusable in its expression. Besides this, a false impression had been created throughout the country as to the food furnished the army, which may never be removed. The charges of General Miles, twice proven false in spirit and substance, are therefore the more heinous in their effect. Yet the present Congress promoted General Miles to be Lieutenant-General, and has thus far failed to give to General Shafter the rank of Major-General to retire upon in his old age, and this, after his magnificent campaign at Santiago, as well as his former distinguished services.

R. A. ALGER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CHINA AND HER FOREIGN TRADE.

BY SIR ROBERT HART, G. C. M. G., INSPECTOR-GENERAL OF CHINESE IMPERIAL CUSTOMS AND POSTS.

MANY regard China as a far distant land, with an immense population, but so wanting in all that others possess as to be ready to purchase, in unlimited quantities, whatever is offered for sale; whereas, what is true is this: China needs neither import nor export, and can do without foreign intercourse. A fertile soil, producing every kind of food, a climate which favors every variety of fruit, and a population which for tens of centuries has put agriculture, the productive industry which feeds and clothes, above all other occupations—China has all this and more; and foreign traders can only hope to dispose of their merchandise there in proportion to the new tastes they introduce, the new wants they create, and the care they take to supply what the demand really means.

The sanguine expectations which were expressed when treaties first regulated intercourse, a cycle back, have never been realized. Trade, it is true, has grown, and the revenue derived from it has multiplied; but as yet it is far, far from what our predecessors looked for; and the reason is not that the Chinese Government actively opposed foreign commerce, but that the Chinese people did not require it. Chinese have the best food in the world, rice; the best drink, tea; and the best clothing, cotton, silk and fur; and possessing these staples, and their innumerable native adjuncts, they do not need to buy a penny's worth elsewhere; while their Empire is in itself so great, and they themselves so numerous, that sales to each other make up an enormous and sufficient trade, and export to foreign countries is unnecessary. This explains why sixty years of treaty trade have failed to reach the point the first treaty framers prophesied for it.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Nevertheless, trade has grown, has gone on growing, and will continue to grow. Production has mostly a surplus to dispose of —exchange of products does modify tastes and create wants—and the profits of various transactions encourage traders to try new ventures and extend operations. Thus, an important and increasing international commerce has been founded and fostered, and the business done last year (1899) showed such a marked increase in quantities, values and duties that every one was looking forward to future expansion as a certainty, on a large scale. The first quarter of the present year (1900) exhibited further growth, and the revenue was some twenty-five per cent. better than that of the corresponding quarter in 1899. Unfortunately, the Boxer movement stepped in to upset calculations; and, although local trade has continued south of the Yangtsze River, the northern ports have done little or nothing since June, and may be long in regaining the promising condition they had attained previously. Whether the present disturbances will run through all the Provinces, and be followed by years of anarchy and more or less complete cessation of trade, or the northern half of the Empire alone is to suffer, cannot to-day be foreseen; but in the north great harm has already been done, and recovery will be slow. Besides, the Manchurian Provinces may cease to be Chinese, and the commerce and wonderful growth of New-chwang during the last two or three years, and its promise of future expansion, may not only cease but disappear—at all events, as far as China and old channels are concerned.

Foreign trade is, in fact, at the close of an old chapter and is commencing a new one, and a serious question here meets the looker-on. Will possible changes for the better on the foreign side make up for probable changes for the worse on the native? Will any improvement in treaties, in mercantile methods and in commercial regulations make up for loss of customers and for decrease in the producing and consuming power of the Chinese? That this year's doings will long affect trade prejudicially may be taken for granted; and that the evil effects may continue to work harmfully for years to come is almost as certain. The whole matter bristles with difficulties when fairly, fully and calmly considered, and the Far Eastern trouble will be felt in many a quarter that does not yet realize how intimately economic conditions connect man and man. The siege of the Peking legations will

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

long be laid to China's charge as a monstrous crime, even although it was preceded by the seizure of the Taku forts without any declaration of war; but, whether the joint action of the treaty Powers may not do more than vindicate the majesty of international law, may not, in fact, kill commerce, can only be known when negotiations are allowed to be begun, and the ensuing stipulations have laid down the lines for future intercourse.

Chinese may be said to be born traders; but they did not originally require to go outside the bounds of their own ring fence to engage in business. The outlying parts and dependencies need not be referred to, seeing that the eighteen Provinces of China proper—each of them as large as and many of them more populous than most European states—afford room enough for every kind of operation and transaction. Government taxation has always and everywhere been of the lightest possible kind, and what are called "squeezes" have been either legitimate collections other than the dues and duties foreign trade tariffs published, or such variable amounts as traders have compounded for between their own offer and the sum the collector would consent to accept below the rate fixed by the tariff concerned. Very wealthy individuals have, from time to time, been called on for special and occasionally large contributions during periods of provincial or national difficulty. But, on the whole, trade has not been charged beyond what it could afford to pay. When a tax looks like becoming too heavy, traders simply close their establishments as a protest, and the local officials soon remedy the matter; and it is curious to see how, in this weakest and yet toughest of Empires, age and experience have worked out what may be styled automatic action to keep the huge machine in order. It must be remembered that each Province is a little kingdom in itself, and has its own budget, while Government interferes as little as possible, and whatever the people can do for themselves the Government avoids doing for them. Our golden rule says "*Do* unto others," and hence so much that is intolerant in philanthropy and fussy in benevolence; while the Chinese corresponding dict says "Do *not*," and the result is a national avoidance of interference and wide-spread tolerance, each side, of course, falling more or less into a pitfall when it does too much or too little. Trade has thus been free to follow requirement; demand and supply have obeyed their natural laws; hamlet has traded with hamlet, town with

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

country, and province with province; the coast has been crowded with junks, the rivers and canals with boats, and the roads with carts, pack animals and porters. And this has gone on in much the same way for thirty centuries.

When the foreigner appeared, changes began; and, although change has as yet only touched the fringe of the Empire, its effect has been felt in various ways inland. At first, the foreign merchant was in China on sufferance, and had to abide by local practice and accept local rule. Then came the opium and "Arrow" wars, and the reigns of the Emperors Tao Kwang and Heen Fang saw added to the original laws and tariffs of the Empire the tariffs and regulations of foreign trade, and the stipulations of treaties. To any foreigner who reads either treaty or tariff, there is not on the surface anything to object to, and nobody would pronounce either one or the other calculated to hurt or irritate; and yet the other side—the Chinese—has always been of another way of thinking. The most striking among the treaty clauses are those which, under the heading "Extra-territoriality," withdraw foreigners from Chinese control and place them under their own national officials in China; and, under the heading of "The Most Favored Nation," provide that whatever is accorded to newcomers will be enjoyed by their predecessors. The "Extra-territoriality" stipulation may have relieved the native official of some troublesome duties, but it has always been felt to be offensive and humiliating, and has ever a disintegrating effect, leading the people on one hand to despise their own Government and officials, and on the other to envy and dislike the foreigner withdrawn from native control. The "Most Favored Nation" clause has always stood in the way of change, and prevented the Chinese Government from securing and conceding various ameliorations in exchange for special advantages, seeing that, although new negotiators might be willing to give a *quid pro quo*, their predecessors would claim the advantage but reject and refuse to be bound by the conditions. There is also a "Missionary" clause for the protection of missionaries and converts, but in this paper on Trade it need not be discussed.

The five per cent. tariff may be pronounced unobjectionable and suitable; but it is supplemented by a special rule which allows goods to be carried from or to a port to or from any inland place, however distant, on payment of a transit due of two and one-half

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

per cent. The foreigner wishes to read this rule as exempting his goods, if imports, from all subsequent, and if exports, from all anterior taxation; while the Chinese official maintains that it merely protects a transit between port and place. This is already a sufficient cause for disputes and ill-feeling; but the real hardship caused by this incomplete stipulation lies deeper. In the first place, it takes no account of the immense size of the Empire or the Provinces to be passed through, or of the fact that each Province is a little kingdom in itself, manages its own taxation and finances, and is caused serious embarrassment by a stipulation which neither recognizes its circumstances and requirements, nor was made a subject of provincial discussion and arrangement in advance. It is not quite an adequate reply to this complaint to say that the Central Government, having entered into an international engagement for the whole, ought to have thereon proceeded to rearrange the parts. In the second place, while the stipulation was only intended for application to foreign traders and foreign trade proper, it soon became the practice of unscrupulous persons, foreign and native, to take advantage of it—the latter to escape provincial taxation, and the former to create a new source of gain out of fees received for passing Chinese property as belonging to foreigners.

It has thus come to pass that Chinese officials have felt themselves belittled and inconvenienced by treaty and tariff, and foreign trade and foreign intercourse have consequently never been regarded by them with sympathetic eye. Some one once remarked to the great Wên Hsiang, Chinese Prime Minister, so to speak, during the minority of the Emperor Tung Chih, that surely the increasing revenue derived from foreign trade must make its growth agreeable to the Chinese Government. "Agreeable!" retorted Wên Hsiang. "Quite the contrary! Every sign of growth means another provincial difficulty; and, instead of delighting in the increase of foreign trade revenue, we would willingly tax ourselves equivalently and pay over the amount to foreigners to keep them out of the country!" Doubtless, there was some exaggeration in this; but it fairly expressed the real feeling of the official mind in this connection, and Wên Hsiang was one of the ablest, fairest, friendliest and most intelligent Mandarins ever met by foreigners. Prince Kung, as is well known, said to the British Minister, about the same time: "Take

Univ. of Tulsa Library
Tulsa, Oklahoma

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

away your opium and your missionaries, and you will be welcome!" During the negotiation of the never-ratified Alcock Convention in 1868, the same Wên Hsiang one day said: "Do away with your Extra-territoriality clause, and merchant and missionary may settle anywhere and everywhere; but retain it, and we must do our best to confine you and our trouble to the treaty ports!"

These sayings of two of China's most eminent men have a weighty meaning. China's treaties are said, and may seem to the foreigners concerned, to have been negotiated. But, in point of fact, they were, in the first instance, drafted by the foreign negotiator, and if not dictated, were so hurriedly drawn up and concluded that they ignored, or rather did not take the trouble to ascertain, the provincial circumstances therewith connected. So that, fair and suitable as they may appear to the foreigner, they were and are, in some of their more important practical points, condemned by Chinese as both damaging and unworkable; and thus, although ratified and sanctioned by Imperial Decree, they have neither been popular nor an unqualified success. When later and perhaps less dictatorial negotiators subsequently came to China, begging for treaties, China acceded. But such new negotiations, on the Chinese side, did not aim at correcting former mistakes—except on one occasion, when the foreigner allowed a "most favored nation" clause to be so worded as to make enjoyment of an advantage entail acceptance of the conditions of its original grant, and at the same time withdrew one or two other demands, when the Chinese negotiator said he would assent to them provided Chinese in the country concerned were similarly treated. They simply tried to keep out everything new; to give the newcomer only what some predecessors had previously extorted, and so to keep the evil of foreign intercourse at a point already understood, instead of injudiciously expanding it further. Thus initial obstacles have been perpetuated, and with the exception of the Alcock Convention no negotiation, to the Chinese mind, has held the balance fairly. The non-ratification of that convention was damaging, for it had been negotiated leisurely and in a sympathetic and friendly spirit, and Chinese officials regarded its rejection as equivalent to saying that their interests must always give way before what the foreigner thought to be his.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Later treaties, too, have had one other unwholesome effect. The foreign negotiator generally presented himself in a more or less beseeching attitude, and China assented—generously, as she thought—to his prayers for treaty relations. But ratifications once exchanged, what China had granted as treaty advantages forthwith became, in the hands of the other party, treaty "rights," and woe betide China if she failed to live up to her new duty! It is, of course, not unnatural for those who have to administer a treaty already made to interpret it literally; but, all the same, Chinese officials have felt mortified and "sold," and treaty relations have sunk in their estimation. It is not altogether inexplicable, then, that foreign intercourse has been seen on its darker side by the Chinese, or that foreign trade has continued to be regarded as at the best only something to be tolerated but not encouraged. Both intercourse and trade would benefit China, but for the first to be welcome it must be sympathetic, and for the second to be encouraged it must be so shaped as not to pinch.

Apart from its being a thorn in the side of the provincial administrations, owing to various difficulties originating in transit abuses, the advent of the foreigner has also been a death-blow to old and long recognized vested interests, and notably to China's own shipping trade and junk owners. The coasting trade which fleets of junks carried on fifty years ago has almost been destroyed between New-chwang and the southern ports, and much of the southern trade has likewise passed from native to foreign bottoms; while on the Yangtsze, an inland water, an ever-increasing home trade is attracting more and more foreign-flag steamers. Such change is not all bad; freights are lighter, goods are safer, passages are quicker, insurance is possible, and regularity has developed trade and increased passenger traffic. But the untravelled Chinese, who at first smarted under loss of business, has now travelled, and he asks, Does any other country in the world allow foreign flags to participate in its coasting trade? Does any other throw open its inland waters to outsiders, and those, too, outsiders who are not merely enjoying special commercial advantages, but are also by treaty extra-territorialized? So that such change is not all good. The native capitalist of former days is a beggar now, and the crowds of junkmen he employed are as angry with their Government for permitting the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

foreigner to step in and seize such local trade as with the foreigner himself for doing so.

In all such cases, the transition period is a bitter one. Many suffer, and much bad blood is engendered; but time, that wonderful restorative, brings its remedy, and much Chinese capital is now invested in steamers. The Chinaman is taking many a leaf from the foreign interloper, and the day will yet come when China's coast trade and river traffic will all be done by vessels under the Chinese flag. Doubtless, the same kind of experience, and the angry feeling with which any man sees another interfere and take the bread out of his mouth, have also had something to do with the readiness with which railway lines have been destroyed and trains wrecked during the Boxer troubles, and perhaps, too, even with some of the difficulties foreign enterprise stumbles against inland. Whether the superior strength of even a more civilized nation can be legitimately employed to dictate, or even to obtain international concessions of a kind which, on the one hand, create difficulties for an internal administration, and, on the other, displace native methods and substitute foreign enterprise, need not be discussed. But it is an unquestionable fact that native populations will always feel sore when ousted from business by privileged foreigners, and that in China grants of advantages which are made at the expense of and without consideration for or the consent of the nation's component parts—the Provinces—will cause ill-will and end in failure.

A notable instance of this latter kind is the concession which opened all inland waters recently to steam navigation. Not only were the Provinces neither consulted nor taken into consideration, but the concession became known to the public, and was even formulated, before negotiation had had its final say in the matter. The Chinese ministers were proceeding on the assumption that the waters would be opened to steam in accordance with either existing native craft rules or new regulations yet to be drawn up; and it was so far a conditional concession. But, unfortunately, the first form it appeared under in public was absolute, and the inland waters were spoken of as if opened to steam without regulations! The result has been what might be expected. The experiment is a failure in the eyes of the world, precisely to the extent to which it has been attempted to subordinate it to necessary rule, and bend it to meet existing local

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

conditions; and it has irritated everybody—native merchant and foreign merchant, foreign official and native official. Some will question the wisdom of accepting such a concession at all—a concession proposing to open inland waters to foreign vessels, considering the difficulties and disputes it must inevitably give rise to in connection with both its trading and its magisterial sides; for occurrences will assuredly furnish inland cases of many kinds for foreign courts to deal with, while inland trading competition, however much it may tend eventually to improve inland trading methods, must certainly disturb inland traffic and hurt inland traders. But, in any case, such a concession ought to be well threshed out, so as to secure the maximum of benefit with a minimum of damage; and not only ought each Province to be separately consulted and separately legislated for, but regulations ought to be adopted of a kind that shall accord with provincial circumstances and requirements, and prevent the concession from being so used as to create internal difficulties, or be injurious to the interests of the native inland traders. The original idea was simply to allow steamers to do in inland waters what junks do. But, while it is a question whether steam traffic could thrive or pay under junk regulations, it is also worth consideration whether they should be not only extra-territorialized inland, but also be so privileged as to hurt native interests and oust boat owners and native traders.

What foreign merchants can to-day do in China may, without going into details, or loading this paper with statistics, be thus described: They may import foreign goods into China, and export native products from China, through any one of some thirty treaty ports, on payment of a tariff duty amounting to what was five per cent. on the values of 1860; and they may take foreign goods to, and bring native products from, any place inland, on payment of an additional half tariff duty, as Transit Due. They may also convey Chinese produce from treaty port to treaty port, paying a full export duty on shipment and a half duty on landing. At the treaty ports where they reside, they are freed from all local taxation, and they may bring in whatever they require for their own personal and household use, duty free. Everywhere they are withdrawn from Chinese control, and placed under that of their own national officials, the consuls; but merchandise can be moved only in accordance with Chinese customs regula-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tions, and ships must anchor in accordance with harbor rules and the directions of the Chinese harbor-masters. Merchants may trade with and employ whatever persons they please, and their movements are free and unrestricted. Such, in a few words, is the foreign merchant's position in China. Treaty makers secured for him all he asked for, and the Chinese Government assented to it. It is not desirable that he should live everywhere, seeing that he is withdrawn from Chinese jurisdiction; but in the case of missionaries, this prohibition is not enforced, although the right is open to question, as being found only in the Chinese text and not in the corresponding foreign text of a treaty which says that the foreign text rules wherever opinion differs as to interpretation. The merchant's transit rights, which practically open to him or his agent every market in the interior, have the drawbacks already alluded to—drawbacks which originated in either ignorance of or inattention to local requirements, in defective legislation and in abuse of the treaty privilege. Otherwise, the foreign merchant's status and freedom leave nothing to be desired, except from the Chinese point of view, which thinks them too privileged. As to the merchandise he may deal in, the only article a foreigner may not touch is salt; and he must take out special permits and comply with special conditions if he trades in munitions of war; and he does trade in them, and finds it profitable; and he is not allowed to export native rice from China. He is thus free to import whatever he thinks he can find a market for, except salt, and to export whatever he can find in the country for sale except rice. Weekly mails carry his correspondence to all parts of the globe, telegraph lines connect him with Chinese places inland, and cables with the rest of the world; local banks supply all banking facilities; post-offices compete for the honor and profit of carrying his mails; newspapers are at hand to ventilate questions of all kinds and advertise his wares and ships; schools are springing up for the education of the children that cannot be sent home, and there are churches and chapels for all denominations of worshippers, lawyers and courts for all sorts of litigation, and doctors and hospitals for all who are ailing. He has his own docks for repairing and building ships, mills for weaving cloth, and manufactories of various kinds. He has also lately been building railroads, and syndicates have been formed to build more, as well as to work mines and start other industries

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the interior. The Boxer doings have, however, interfered with these later developments, and have led thinking people to wonder whether the exploitation of China inland is the safest of paying investments for capital.

Such being the condition and methods of Chinese commerce at this date, as far as foreign trade is concerned, all who are interested in it will naturally ask what can be done to extend and expand it in the future, and make it at once more profitable to foreigners and more acceptable to natives, whether traders or officials. This task was being taken in hand when the Boxer movement was growing; but although not abandoned, it is postponed, one might almost say, indefinitely. In the autumn of 1899, a special commission was appointed by Edict to consider the subject of tariff revision and questions therewith connected, and its members hoped to make it the commencement of a new era of profitable and acceptable commercial relations. These were Sheng Hseuen Huai (a titular metropolitan official, who is Director-General of Telegraphs and Railroads, and Manager of the China Merchants' Steam Navigation Company), Nieh Chi Kuei (Provincial Treasurer and Acting Official of the Province of Kiang-su), and Sir Robert Hart (Inspector-General of Customs and Posts). After several meetings they separated in May last, to resume their sittings again in October. But the Boxers reached Peking a few days afterward, and governmental chaos has upset all plans. The commission would probably have elaborated various proposals for the consideration of the Chinese Government and the treaty powers in the interest of trade. Meantime, it may not be without its advantages to put forward some of the views then discussed, and some of the points which the experience of the past shows to be worth reconsideration.

The Extra-territoriality and Most Favored Nation clauses will, of course, be retained, whether old treaties are revived or new ones negotiated after the present disorder ends. But to the latter it would be fair, and in the general interest, too, to add a rider to the effect that whatever power claims to participate in any advantage newly accorded to another power by China will, on the other hand, accept and be bound by the conditions on which such advantages are granted.

The Tariff requires revision, for since 1860 all values have altered, and many new commodities have appeared. Whether it is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to remain a five per cent. tariff or be made ten per cent. is a point for negotiators to deal with. The commission consulted the provincial officials in this connection, and purposed to propose a ten per cent. import duty, plus a five per cent. transit due, payable simultaneously, coupled with the total abolition of all other taxes on such imports forever after and everywhere, and the Government was to arrange for the equitable division of the amount so realized between the central and the provincial treasuries. As for exports, it was under consideration to retain the five per cent. rate, but do away with the right to bring produce from the interior under transit passes, coupled with an undertaking to refund to the exporter, at the time of export to a foreign country, whatever amounts he had paid on such produce over and above a half tariff rate between the place of purchase and the port of export. Some such arrangement would satisfy the provincial officials, would efface hostility to the spread of foreign trade, and would also at once do away with the malpractices and abuses connected with the present unpopular transit system.

The most important point of all, however, is that which is connected with negotiation. Negotiation concerning commercial matters ought not to be in any degree of the nature of dictation, and it ought to proceed slowly and cautiously, and not only with a perfect knowledge of facts and circumstances, but with a full and friendly consideration for the other party's views and necessities; and in no country is this more necessary than in China, an Empire composed of a score of grand Provinces, each a kingdom in itself, with its own budget and its own system of taxation. What is good and suitable elsewhere is not necessarily so in China, and a negotiator there, to do any matter justice and formulate a workable and useful rule, must put himself in the other's place, and see with the other's eyes. Such procedure, in addition to being what justice and common sense demand, would have the additional recommendation and advantage of winning the native negotiator's sympathy, and enlisting the Chinese Government's support, and so would secure honest effect for the rules agreed on.

But let negotiators be as painstaking as you please, they and their Governments only lay the rails, so to speak, and the merchant himself must provide the trains and find the passengers. Individual study, individual exertion, individual tact and initiative are the necessary conditions of success in any individual commer-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cial career, and in the thence growing general expansion of commerce. Governments do the best they can, according to their lights and requirements, to provide openings and afford protection; but the real work of founding a house, building up a business, extending connections and making it pay, must be done by the merchant himself. Whoever looks Chinawards must also remember that the country has its own civilization, and has been perfectly settled for tens of centuries; that it has an immense trade of its own, by the side of which foreign commerce is so far a mere bagatelle; that although foreign commerce is growing and will go on growing, the tendency is for it to pass more and more into Chinese hands in China (as I write a case of California claret has just been brought in, which, the label tells me, was imported and bottled by a Chinese store-keeper in Shanghai); that competition is great, and individual profits small; that taste for novelty is to be cultivated, wants created and customers' wishes consulted; and that, although with a population of four hundred millions there would seem to be no bounds to the possible demand of consumers, the Chinese are quite able to dispense with foreign commerce and supply all they require for their own consumption.

As for those who wish to improve communications, build railroads, open mines and start various industries, they, too, should remember that their eagerness to supply does not necessarily mean a corresponding demand, and that whatever they do take in hand can only be a success provided native sentiment and prejudices are studied and shown consideration for. The syndicates which handle concessions owe it to their shareholders to see that their title is not only legally indisputable, but locally acceptable; otherwise, failure must be, and dividends need not be, looked for. The motto of the Chinese trader is to live and let live, and his trading strength lies mainly in combination, an inherited science of business organization, safe for its members and not harmful to their clients; and he is quite a match for the foreigner whose aim is to cut the ground from under his neighbor's feet, and whose commercial gospel is that competition is the life of trade.

ROBERT HART.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE SIMULTANEOUS NEWSPAPERS OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY.

BY ALFRED HARMSWORTH, EDITOR OF THE LONDON "DAILY MAIL."

THE comparatively slight progress that has been made in the development of the newspaper during the last hundred years inclines one to the belief that we are still merely at the fringe of journalistic development.

The newspaper as an institution is an essentially modern outgrowth of civilization. The earliest British example is seen in *The Courant, or Weekly News,* of 1621. Less than three hundred years old, the Press is a thing of yesterday when compared with the Theatre, which had reached a high stage of development long before the Christian era; or with the Parliament, which in one form or another existed among the most ancient civilizations.

In America, the issue of the pioneer paper, *Publick Occurrances, both Foreign and Domestick,* from a Boston press in 1690, marked the birth of that vast newspaper enterprise which makes such an impression upon the Englishman who crosses the Atlantic for the first time. The fact that the little news-sheet was promptly suppressed by the authorities of Massachusetts forms a curious commentary on the subsequent extraordinary growth of periodical literature in the United States.

Fourteen years later, on April 24, 1704, *The Boston News-Letter* was established.

The report of the Tenth Census, published in 1884, showed twenty-nine daily journals published in the city of New York, as against twenty-eight at that time published in London.

Having in view the vast supply of morning, evening, weekly and Sunday editions, employing scores of thousands of workers and consuming millions of tons of paper, my assertion that the newspaper Press has shown comparatively slight development dur-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing the past century may, perhaps, seem paradoxical, and be met with considerable incredulity. But I maintain that, considering the fact that practically every new invention of real importance is sooner or later called into the service of newspaper production in one way or another, the development has been less than might reasonably have been expected.

Telegraphy, telephony, electrotyping, process engraving, rapid transit both by land and water—all these, and a host of other inventions, have been applied in one way or another to the newspaper, and yet newspapers have not exhibited such rapidity of progress in mechanical matters as is seen in the evolution of the up-to-date battleship, or such perfection of organization as has been attained by one or other of the greater American Trusts.

To the enthusiastic American temperament—which does not worry about the past, considers the present altogether delightful, and takes the most optimistic view possible of the future—these remarks may come somewhat as a surprise.

"No progress indeed!"—I can imagine the tone of indignant protest. "Look at the rotary press, the mechanical typesetter, the lightning stereotyping box, the use of the cablegram, of wood pulp, the development of the 'interview,' the equipment regardless of cost of the war correspondent with his special despatch boat and his despatch riders, the more popular presentation of news and ideas, and last, but not least, the abundant use of illustrations!"

But many of the developments just referred to by my supposed objector are not altogether new, and some of them are not unmixed blessings, as, for example, the last of them—the illustrations which are so much in fashion nowadays.

I venture to think that twenty years hence, if illustrations are then as frequent a feature of purely news journals—which I greatly doubt—the present day newspaper picture will seem to our sons as great a curiosity as does to us a copy of the London *Morning Post* or the New York *Advertiser* of a hundred years ago.

An occasional newspaper illustration, if it can be properly produced, is no doubt a good thing, and is appreciated as helpful by the reader; but many of the present-day illustrations are quite unnecessary, and are merely given as a matter of habit, or because rival journals use them, or even for the less urgent reasons

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that there is a certain amount of space to be decorated and artists or photographers to be kept occupied.

The political cartoons and fashion plates are often excellent; but, when portraits are attempted, the result is usually unrecognizable, if not absolutely grotesque. Even when half-tone engravings are employed, the present imperfections of the printing press often reduce them to mere smudges. No daily journal which relies principally upon its illustrations has been, in any real sense, an overwhelming success. Even the genius and untiring labor of the late Mr. Thomas could not raise the *Daily Graphic* of London to such a high-water mark of success as its weekly namesake.

The fact is that newspapers throughout the whole world have gone on imitating each other for many years past, with here and there a minute and superficial improvement or alteration, which is heralded as a great stroke of originality. When a new journal appears—after a prolonged period of sensational promises—one turns to it in the hope of finding something really novel, something that will compel other newspaper proprietors and editors to seriously consider their ways—but only to be once more disappointed. The new arrival is "new" only in title and in the personnel of its staff. In matter, style, news and form of production it is only a more or less colorable imitation of some existing journal, and we have just one more newspaper of the old orthodox type.

Some of us have not yet realized the fact that the ordinary news-sheet is hopelessly clumsy in shape, verbose as to matter, and most imperfect as a record. I am not attacking the Press of any particular country, nor do I except any one country from my statement; the differences between the newspapers of different countries are very slight, certainly not so great as the contrast in the laying out of their cities, in the general appearance, for instance, of such centres as New York, London and Paris. This is certainly a noteworthy phenomenon, when one realizes the distinctions in temperament, modes of thought and methods of action which exist between the leading nations of the world.

With the newspapers of the whole civilized world before me each week, I look in vain for any great and impressive stroke of originality or daring. We still cling to the clumsy and awkward shape in which our newspapers are issued, and the man who has attempted to manipulate one of them on a windy day will best

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

appreciate the force of my remarks. Why should this relic of the days of the old and slow flat printing-press still inconvenience us daily? By the use of improved machinery it would be possible to issue the newspaper of the future in what is obviously its proper form—a small, portable and neatly indexed publication of the size of page of the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, and of the bulk and appearance of the New York *Outlook*, the best of weekly reviews. Something of the kind has been done in Germany, and one proposal to issue a daily journal in handy form was made in England (by Mr. Stead), but fell through.

Probably, the inherent conservatism which shows itself in men of all nationalities has something to do with the general attitude regarding this not unimportant question of shape; but this is a poor excuse at best. It will not satisfy the newspaper reader of the twentieth century.

The journals of the principal countries present at first sight certain strong contrasts, but a little examination proves that these are superficial and apparent rather than real.

To the Englishman who goes to America for the first time, some of the newspapers seem to be outrages on the public taste, and all of them to be arranged on a principle difficult for him to grasp at the outset. But after a very short acquaintance he is able to find his way about the American newspaper without much trouble, and he begins to feel at home in it. Sooner or later, the fact dawns upon him that it is practically the same as his newspaper at home, the differences lying mainly in its unwieldy bulk, "scare headlines," and a greater directness of style.

When the American comes to England, the British journal sits as heavily upon him as does the British climate. I have often watched him twisting and turning one of these great, big, dull puzzles of ours, yearning for the little home news that he may, or may not, find buried there, and thoroughly disgusted with what he considers the lack of arrangement, and even of news itself. But, as in the case of the Englishman, he soon discovers that the news is there very much as in his own familiar journal. The chief difference lies in the fact that it does not stand prominently out on the page and strike his eye at a first glance.

Turning to the German Press, one finds that, although as a rule very accurate, and in some cases issued in a far more handy form than the familiar "blanket sheet" with which most of us

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wrestle at our breakfast tables, it is, as a whole, stupendously heavy. In the words of Mr. Charles A. Dana, no mean critic:

"There are very few first-rate papers in Germany, not one anywhere which is to be compared to the American newspaper in the variety of news that it furnishes, in the amount of resources that are applied to it, or generally in the ability with which it is conducted. The German newspapers are like the German learned men, exceedingly learned, but not always in contact with the living sentiment of the people. They pursue their own theories, remote from the people, and do not feel their pulse and know their thoughts and understand their part at all times."

Among the newspapers that, in my opinion, are now making real progress, setting aside their entire lack of commercial morality, are some of the French journals. They have always been noted for their high literary excellence. The anonymous editorial has never been a particularly strong feature of the French newspaper. On the other hand, pure literature, in the shape of fiction or criticism, has been one of its chief characteristics. Nearly every French man of letters since the Revolution—and to some extent before—has been a regular or occasional writer for the Press. One has only to mention, among noted French journalists, such men as Marat, Mirabeau, Brissot, Camille Desmoulins, Sainte-Beuve, and, in more recent days, Thiers, Lemaitre, Sandeau, Zola and M. Brunetière, to call to the reader's mind the names of many others that might be enumerated. The French papers are now adding to their pre-eminent literary excellence very good news-services. For example, *Le Matin* is in many ways a better-written newspaper than is issued either in the United States or in Great Britain. In addition to its own news, it gives practically the whole news-service of the London *Times*.

One of the chief reasons for the slow progress of modern journalism may be due to the undoubted fact that, with brilliant exceptions, the best brains of the Anglo-Saxon countries have not hitherto gone into the profession of journalism, or have left it after a somewhat brief career. In Great Britain, they generally find their way to the Bar or into the public service. Notable examples of this process may be seen in the cases of Mr. John Morley, who left an editorial chair for a seat in the Cabinet, and of Sir Alfred Milner, who, after a somewhat brief career on the *Pall Mall Gazette*, entered a Government office, and is now Governor of Cape Colony and High Commissioner of South Africa.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

One might also mention Lord Salisbury, who, in his younger days, was a writer for the daily Press. In passing, it is impossible to avoid lamenting the loss which British journalism sustains in the fact that Lord Rosebery's unrivalled powers as a critic, debater and organizer are not at its disposal.

While the Bar and the public service have stolen so many of our best men in England, business and politics have proved equally attractive on the other side of the Atlantic.

I have sometimes thought, and I have been severely admonished for making the suggestion, that British and American newspapers are not always equal to the average intelligence of their readers. Possibly, this is one of the reasons why, among the more educated classes, newspaper opinion carries weight merely because of its known influence on the gentleman whom in England we call "the man in the street." It is commonly supposed that the individual just alluded to has no interest in literature, that he would rather read the language he is accustomed to speak, and that a slangy colloquial style has most charms for him. Now, while it is undoubtedly true that the ponderous and involved style adopted by some British newspaper writers of repute is not at all to his liking, I do not think that any such sweeping assertion can fairly be made. It is certainly the case that the average newspaper reader has shown his appreciation of writers like Rudyard Kipling and Andrew Lang, and still more emphatically of G. W. Steevens, whose recent death in South Africa called forth eloquent tributes from both sides of the Atlantic.

Is the "power of the Press" what it was?

With all its world-wide dissemination of facts and opinions, I am certain that the influence of the newspaper has not grown during recent years. In England, the gradually disappearing editorial—or "leader," as we term it—formerly possessed great weight. It was read and quoted by all men of intelligence. A large proportion—probably the majority—of Englishmen formed their views by the pronouncements of their favorite papers. The editor and the leader-writer controlled much of the thinking of the nation. This is certainly the case no longer. I greatly doubt if one newspaper reader in fifty condescends even to glance at the article which presents him with a well-considered judgment on some important questions of the day. The great cry is for news. The latest telegrams and reports are the first things that are read.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But even here the Press has lost in reputation. Lately, there has begun a kind of internecine warfare between the various organs of the Press, by which they very largely injure their own positions and that of their opponents. An item of news published in one paper is immediately discredited in another, and the public, naturally enough, comes to the opinion that newspapers are usually inaccurate, and too often dismiss a perfectly correct statement as mere "newspaper talk." It is highly probable that the craze for collecting more news if possible than one's contemporaries has something to do with this. I may be pardoned for saying that the newspapers of America seem to me to devote far too much space to news items altogether trivial and unworthy of publication. As Mr. Charles Dudley Warner said:

"The journal must cease to be a sort of waste-basket at the end of a telegraph wire, into which any reporter, telegraph operator, or gossip-monger can dump whatever he pleases. We must get rid of the superstition that value is given to an unimportant 'item' by sending it a thousand miles over a wire."

In England, where the newspaper is still treated very seriously by a large section of the public, this sort of thing is beginning, but it will probably not go far.

It needs to be pointed out, too, that the mere multiplication of newspapers, and the speed with which one set of views is controverted, or an item of news contradicted, tends very largely to the destruction of what is called "the power of the Press."

Prince Bismarck, in a cynical moment—probably irritated by an editorial opposing his policy—once defined journalism as nothing more than printing ink on paper. But his belittlement of the Press needs to be read in the light of the fact, that never in the whole history of statesmanship has any man made more constant and effectual use of the Press than did Prince Bismarck himself. His scornful dictum may be disregarded; but there is a very real danger lest the public may come to a similar valuation of newspapers. The public craving for sensation, and the competition that makes every editor eager, if possible, to produce a more imposing budget of news than his rivals, are undoubtedly answerable for much that has tended to undermine the influence of the Press.

The question what to put before the public, and in what manner to place it before them, is one that calls for the keenest acumen and best judgment on the part of the newspaper director. Here,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

undoubtedly, the Press of the United States is in advance of that of Great Britain. Such newspaper leaders as Pulitzer, Dana, Bennett, Hearst, Raymond, Jones, Childs, Medill, Lawson, Russell, Cummings, Taylor, Pulsifer, Halstead, Patterson, De Young, Singerley, Godkin, Greeley, McKelway, Watterson and Wilbur Storey have had but few counterparts with us. The instinct that tells what is news, and how the public will best take it, is not given to every writer. There is a great art in feeling the pulse of the people.

Probably another secret of the waning influence of the newspaper is to be found in its wearisome prolixity. Our age is a busy one, and men work at a pressure hitherto unknown. They cannot afford the time to wade through a column of verbose descriptive matter in search of a problematical item of news. This is becoming more and more recognized in America, where the brief, "snappy" style and the informative headline have their native place. But the information afforded by the headline should find confirmation in the paragraphs that follow.

It must not, however, be supposed that, because I have passed this criticism upon the Press of the nineteenth century, I take any gloomy or pessimistic view of the future. On the contrary, the future of journalism in the twentieth century impresses me as being full of hopefulness. There are abundant signs that we are witnessing the birth of developments in newspaper enterprise which will make the past look insignificant by contrast. To predict with certainty the precise form that will be taken by those developments would call for the gifts of the prophet or the seer; but there are certain tendencies among us to-day which have come to stay, and I am strongly of opinion that behind them lie the forces which will direct the future growth and shape of newspaper enterprise.

We are entering the century of combination and centralization. For good or for ill, the day of the small trader is past, and that of the great emporium has come. The tendency is for large corporations to absorb the individual. I do not say that this is the best possible state of things; I only refer to it as a fact to be dealt with. I feel certain that the newspaper of the twentieth century will be drawn into the vortex of combination and centralization. In fact, given the man, the capital, the organization, and the occasion, there seems to be no reason why one or two newspapers

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

may not presently dominate great sections of the United States, or almost the whole of Great Britain. In other words, where there are now a multitude of papers—good, bad and indifferent—there will be then one or two great journals.

I do not know whether the thing could be done in a lifetime, for such an organization would necessarily be of slow growth, but I have no doubt that it could be done; the project is already forming itself in a humble way on both sides of the Atlantic. In the United States, Mr. Hearst is issuing his *American* in Chicago, his *Examiner* in San Francisco, and his *Journal* in New York. In England, I may be allowed to point to my own newspaper, which is published simultaneously each day in London and Manchester, two great centres of population two hundred miles apart, and, by means of my own railroad trains, is read at breakfast tables five hundred miles apart each morning. It will also be known to most Americans that Mr. Pulitzer has two papers, and that the Galveston *News* is published simultaneously at Dallas and Galveston in Texas.

Though not bearing on my scheme, a remarkable instance is that of Mr. Bennett, who publishes his journal simultaneously in two continents, with the Atlantic rolling between. Thus the views of the New York *Herald* are spread throughout Europe each day, almost as rapidly and effectively as they are in the United States. In passing, one should remark that Mr. Bennett has adopted the singular but not unwise policy of conducting his American newspaper in Europe, whereby he not only secures the best news-service of any United States journal, but by persistent personal effort is able to wield a very considerable influence on European politics as they are affected by those of America, and *vice versa*.

To a mere theorist, such a simultaneous issue of a newspaper in a dozen centres, separated by hundreds or even thousands of miles, would seem to be fraught with difficulties so great as to exclude it from the arena of practical effort. But experience, both in America and in Great Britain, has proved that these difficulties —as is usually the case in everyday working life—melt into thin air when they are resolutely faced by the man who means to surmount them. So far as the plan has been tried by practical journalists, backed by sufficient capital, it has been found to work smoothly, economically and practically.

I wish to emphasize this point. The suggestion for a simul-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

taneously published paper—national in its truest sense—is not the dream of a visionary, nor the outcome of a heated imagination. It has been practically tried, not on the large scale that I shall proceed to outline, but locally and sectionally. Chapter and verse in the history of modern journalism can be produced in proof of the feasibility of all that is here asserted.

My idea of the newspaper of the twentieth century may be thus expressed in brief. Let us suppose one of the great American newspapers—say *The Sun,* of New York, in my opinion perhaps the best arranged of all American newspapers—under the control of a man of the journalistic ability of Delane, the greatest of the former editors of the London *Times,* certainly the greatest political editor in the history of journalism, backed by an organization as perfect as that of the Standard Oil Company, and issued simultaneously each morning in (say) New York, Boston, Chicago, Pittsburg, St. Louis, Philadelphia, and other points in America; or at London, Liverpool, Manchester, Bristol, Edinburgh, Belfast and Newcastle, in Great Britain. Is it not obvious that the power of such a paper might become such as we have not yet seen in the history of the Press? And would not such a journal effectually revive the waning influence of the newspaper upon the life and thought of the nation?

The thing is not so improbable as it sounds. The whole tendency of the times, both in America and Great Britain, is toward the concentration of great affairs in the hands of a few. I may perhaps say without offense that the power of the British Parliament is now practically concentrated in the hands of one family, the Cecils, of whom the Marquis of Salisbury is the distinguished head. They, and one or two allies, form an inner ring which dominates the Cabinet, which in its turn rules Parliament.

The control of our railways is now centred in a small organization composed of the heads of those railways, holding regular meetings and working in unison.

Whenever I wend my way along one of our leafy English lanes, and encounter the hideous wagon marked "The Anglo-American Oil Company"—the English name for the Standard Oil Company—it comes forcibly to my mind that what a Rockefeller can do in the matter of oil, with its hundred and one adjuncts, another Trust could effect in the way of news.

Such an organization, or combination, with its forty or fifty

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

simultaneously published journals, each adapted to its particular locality, could dominate the newspaper situation as effectively as Mr. Rockefeller and his able colleagues control the illumination of the British farm laborer's cottage.

But how could such a multiple newspaper come into existence? Obviously, it would have to be initiated by some man, or group of men, holding practically unlimited capital, and possessing intimate knowledge of everything appertaining to the journalism of their country. Such a group might easily be formed of the directors of three or four leading papers of New York or London, forced to an unwilling friendship by the desire to escape competition. By combining their forces, they would be in a position to command the situation.

In my opinion, their first steps would be to buy the best brains, newspapers and machinery, to construct private telegraph wires and cables, or—where existing monopolies for the time prevented that course—to purchase the exclusive or preferential use of the wires. That this can be done is within the knowledge of every newspaper man. The immediate result would be that the journals owned by this combination would secure such capital, such a news service and other advantages that their rivals would be seriously incommoded.

The power to undersell would drive many newspapers into the combination, and little by little rival newspapers would be so weakened that, where they did not die a natural death, their purchase or absorption would be a comparatively easy and inexpensive step. The less important ones would be allowed to drop out of existence, but the others would continue to appear in their old form, but containing much identical news matter, and, of course, under the control of the combination.

By this time the wealth and influence of the combination would have grown to such an extent that opposition would be as futile as it has been in other fields. Backed by the acknowledged facts of an ever-growing circulation, an unlimited capital, and a practical monopoly of all the best writers and news-services of the whole world, the directors of the simultaneous newspaper could carry all before them. After the fashion of the great commercial Trusts of the United States, they could simply stamp out opposition and rivalry. It would be in their power to give any rival newspaper concern the option of either combining with them,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

selling out, or facing financial disaster. They would be able to practically force their own journal upon any city or district. They would hold the newspaper monopoly of the land.

I do not say that such a state of things would be the best possible, either for journalism or for the community. Personally, I should oppose it very vigorously. The history of great Trusts shows that the question is a many-sided one. But I do say that the thing is practicable, and—unless I altogether mistake the signs of the times—it is beginning!

There would be practically no limit to the possibilities of such a development. Possessing its own cables, wires, despatch boats and special trains, the simultaneous newspaper concern would soon have its own paper mills, printing-ink factories, machinery shops and the like; this is already partly true of the London *Times* and other leading journals. It would probably take the control of all railway and street news-stands, and by persistent and overwhelming pressure would compel all news-agents to accept the position of agents of the combine.

All this would involve simultaneous publication in the great centres of population. Distribution over a wide area by means of special newspaper trains has its obvious limitations. It is practicable in England, but would be out of the question in presence of the much greater distances of America. It is of vital importance that the journal should be on sale early and punctually. Distribution by railways is always subject to the contingencies of accident or delay on the line.

The case would be met by the existence of an adequate number of editorial and publishing offices, so distributed among the great centres of population as to be in close touch with all parts of the country, and all connected directly, by special telegraph and telephone wires, with the central office, which would be a great news-distributing agency, as well as the seat of control. My own experience, and that of others, shows that there is no practical difficulty in the way of telegraphing the entire contents of the paper to a distant branch office, where it is set up in exact *fac simile* of the London issue, with the addition of local news, and published simultaneously. It would, of course, be essential to pay adequate attention to this local news. This would involve, as with my own paper, the existence of a local news editor, with his assistants and a staff of reporters, in each centre. The simul-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

taneous newspaper would be so arranged as to provide space for a given number of columns of local news. This could, of course, be increased or diminished as occasion required.

In a simple form, this kind of thing already exists in Great Britain and in America. The smaller local weeklies are seldom of purely local production. With us the whole of the newspaper, with the exception of the middle opening, is edited, set up and printed in London, and is then sent in sheets to the various towns, where a local staff insert the news items and advertisements of the district, and publish the paper. This is not a very high type of journalism, but it works well, and supplies a better service than could be obtained by the local staff alone.

The local editorial staffs, as with my journal, would also act as special correspondents for the metropolitan headquarters. In this way an organized and capable local news service would be substituted for the present method of employing some local resident to send along any news that he may think suitable—a method which frequently breaks down on an emergency, and at best is but a casual and haphazard one. Thus, there would still be abundant scope and employment for the most capable journalists of the nation.

What may be termed the floating journalism of the country would also be absorbed by the simultaneous newspaper. The "free lance," instead of scattering his "copy" broadcast, would, perforce, send it to the combination, through sheer lack of anywhere else to place it. Now, although this free lance work varies greatly in quality, there is always a sufficient proportion of good, and even brilliant, matter to make the asset a valuable one.

Probably, the development of the simultaneous newspaper, with its unlimited advertising powers, would soon result in a number of subsidiary weekly journals and magazines. A weekly edition, or a weekly supplement of miscellaneous matter—something after the fashion of the Sunday editions of the New York newspapers—would soon follow, and the establishment of a weekly illustrated journal of the highest class would be an obvious corollary.

A monopoly of the news-service would almost necessitate a series of weekly supplements, or associated publications, to deal with special subjects. Religion, science, education, finance, commerce, sport, law, medicine, and a host of other subjects of im-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

portance to different sections of the community, would call for more adequate treatment than is possible in the columns of a daily newspaper. My subsidiary journals and magazines already exceed thirty in number, and include evening, weekly and monthly publications.

The simultaneous journal might with advantage be issued in three different forms daily in the more important cities. There would, of course, be the familiar morning and evening editions.

Such a national newspaper would have unrivalled powers of organization in all directions. It is no uncommon thing already for a great journal to equip a scientific expedition, to raise a war fund, or to carry through some great charitable enterprise. The admirable work done in this way by many of the leading American newspapers is too familiar to need further description here. Similar work has been done from time to time in Great Britain.

The simultaneous newspaper would possess powers of this kind which we can hardly estimate, and, under the direction of men whose inclinations turned that way, would very possibly become the centre of a vast network of societies, organizations and institutions.

It is, perhaps, unnecessary to carry further this outline of the possible—and, as I think, the probable—development of newspaper enterprise in the twentieth century. As I have already stated, the principle of such a combination is no new one, and, in detail and at various times, nearly all that is here suggested has been successfully carried out.

It may, however, be objected at this point that the public as a whole is not enamored of Trusts, and would not view such a newspaper combination with any large degree of approval. This may be true enough. I am not recommending Trusts. I am quite alive to the darker side of their history. But I hardly see how the public could prevent the development of a newspaper monopoly. The initial stages would be accomplished without any great publicity, and when once an exclusive news-service had been secured, the rest would follow as a necessary consequence. People would not consign themselves to a condition of total ignorance of all news simply because they objected to a monopoly. To refer to an illustration already used, as long as the oil in the lamp gives a good light and costs a moderate figure, people do not

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

greatly trouble themselves about the Standard Oil Company and its methods.

At this point, it may be well to say something about the advantages and disadvantages which would follow upon the establishment of a simultaneously published national newspaper, holding a monopoly of the Press. To quote Mr. Charles A. Dana again:

> "The modern newspaper literally has its fingers reaching out toward every quarter of the globe, and every finger is sensitive, and every nerve brings back the treasures of intellectual wealth that are stored up there, and a photograph of the occurrences of life that are there taking place."

This finely worded description is not at all exaggerated, but it will be still more true of the simultaneous newspaper of the future, with its unique news-service and its unrivalled opportunities for publicity.

In other words, we shall see—or our children will see—journalism brought to a standard of excellence hitherto unattained. I suppose that perfection will still lie ahead even then, but it is hard to see how the situation could be improved upon. The simultaneous newspaper combination will possess the ablest directors, the most skillful editors, the most brilliant writers, and a monopoly of the news-service. Being its own manufacturer, it will work with the best materials, and, possessing vast resources, it will be able to accept a narrow margin of profit, and thus give the public greater value for their money. By the method of simultaneous publication the provincial purchaser will be placed on an equal footing with the dweller in the capital. As things are, he must either be content with an inferior local production, or wait till late in the day, when the great newspaper arrives by the mail or comes on the cars. Under the new régime he will find the national journal on his breakfast table.

In my opinion, the newspaper that I am describing will be able to maintain a higher tone and literary standard than is usually possible now. It will be able to ignore what may be called "non-news." I refer to the trivial and unimportant items and to the unedifying matter which every editor heartily longs to omit. Critics unacquainted with the Press often ask why all this unnecessary matter is not cast into the waste-paper basket. The answer lies in the existing rivalry and competition between

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

newspapers. If an editor omits all mention of some sensational but unelevating police case, for example, he knows full well that his rival will insert it, and will subsequently boast about his superior news-service! No editor can afford to let even the most superficial critic imagine that he has been caught napping. On the other hand, a newspaper possessing a monopoly could absolutely boycott all such items. I lay strong emphasis upon this, as it affords a solution to a problem that has long troubled all journalists who seek the best interests of the public.

Such a newspaper could maintain a high literary tone, and thus become an educative institution of the greatest value. This is true already of the best journals in most lands, but there is another side to the question. The existence of a gutter Press cannot altogether be ignored. Neither can we afford to neglect the fact that a considerable section of the public patronizes it. The new régime of journalism will promptly put an end to it, and will thus confer an additional benefit on the nation. The simultaneous newspaper will dominate the thought of the country, not so much by its editorials—if editorials continue to be written—as by its general style and tone. In the words of Mr. Charles Dudley Warner:

> "Editorial influence is not dogmatic and direct. The editor does not expect to form public opinion so much by arguments and appeals as by the news he presents and his manner of presenting it, by the iteration of an idea until it becomes familiar, by the reading matter selected, and by the quotation of opinions as news, and not professedly to influence the reader. And this influence is all the more potent because it is indirect, and not perceived by the reader."

Mr. Pulitzer's wonderful stroke of journalistic genius in connection with the Bond issue, Mr. Hearst's successful appeal to the people on the war issue between the United States and Spain, and the work of British newspapers in connection with the South African campaign, go to show what can be done in the direction of influencing public opinion even under existing circumstances. Imagine, then, the influence which would be exerted if an overwhelming majority of the newspapers in the United States spoke with the same voice, supported the same principles, and enunciated the same policy! Such a state of things would be a terror to evil-doers and to the supporters of anything inimical to the commonwealth. Napoleon once remarked: "Four hostile newspapers are more to be feared than a thousand bayonets." But a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hostile Press, issued simultaneously throughout the land, would be simply irresistible.

It has been suggested to me that such an influence, if allowed to run counter to the general opinion of the nation, would result in an intolerable *impasse*. But I do not think such a thing would ever occur, for the simple reason that such a newspaper organization could only be carried out in the hands of thoroughly capable journalists. Mere capital, apart from journalistic ability, has never yet created a successful journal, and I am certain that it could never bring into being a simultaneous newspaper. Now, one of the prime essentials of a good newspaper leader is that he should be in intimate touch with his public. His finger must be on the pulse of the people, and his ear must be ever listening to their voice. He must be quick to note the smallest happenings which indicate the trend of public thought. A journal so demented as to purposely run counter to the honest feeling of the nation would soon have to file its petition and pass out into oblivion. The same would be true of a simultaneous newspaper.

But what side would this great newspaper Trust take in party politics? I do not think it would be called upon to assume a mere party attitude at all. The London *Times* is supposed to support the Government and the party in power at the time, on the ground that the party returned at the polls represents the will of the people. This principle is a sound one. It is not at all necessary that an influential journal should be a party organ. Some of the most successful in Great Britain at the present time are entirely independent of party, and simply aim at expressing the mind of the people. It may be added that nearly all the leading journals of Great Britain at the present day support the Unionist Government. The Radical Press, though highly respectable, is not very influential now.

I think that one of the good influences of a great newspaper monopoly would be seen in its tendency to minimize political differences and to bring about unity of thought and action. Much of the party feeling of the present day, on both sides of the Atlantic, is fed and fostered by certain inflammatory newspapers that depend upon political agitation for their circulation. This consideration would not affect the simultaneous journal, which would be free to advocate the best interests of the country, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

could do so with an influence far wider in its scope than has hitherto been possible.

As far back as 1863, the London *Times* enjoyed almost a monopoly of circulation and publicity. In that year Mr. Cobden drew Mr. Delane's attention to the fact that "four-fifths of the daily newspaper circulation issued from its press." I am not sure that it was at all a bad thing for the country. One strong paper of high tone can do more than a score of party publications daily engaged in quarreling with one another. The influence of the simultaneous newspaper upon Congress and the various local authorities would be effectual just so long as the journal continued to express the mind of the nation. We thus arrive practically at Government by Newspapers, but so long as that is only another name for Government by the People, no one need be alarmed at the outlook.

Thus far, the prospect is a decidedly attractive one, both for the journalist and the public. It would be easy to proceed much further and to indicate wider and more startling developments that might await the simultaneous journal. But it is seldom wise to indulge in dreams, and I have thought it better to confine myself strictly to developments which experiment has proved to be thoroughly practicable.

It is fair to add that, as the most wholesome food may under some circumstances turn to poison, so a great newspaper monopoly might, in bad hands, become nothing less than a national disaster. All would depend very largely upon the man or men at the head of it. In the hands of a weak man—still more so in the hands of an unprincipled one—such an influence might work great mischief.

But I am a firm believer in the sound sense and practical power of the people. Public sentiment has often forced the hand of the politician and brought effectual pressure to bear even upon monopolists. It would not be less potent in the case of a corrupt and mischievous Press.

Doubtless, the idea of another Trust is not a popular one. Experience of monopolies has not made us love them. They generally tend to raise the price and to lower the quality of the article they control. I do not think, however, that this would necessarily be the case with a national newspaper combination. Practical journalism is a very different thing from a corner in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pork or a deal in oil. It so essentially lives upon the approval of the public that any attempt to abuse its position would only recoil upon itself. People are not obliged to buy newspapers, as they are in the case of food-stuffs and clothing.

It may also be objected that the establishment of a great newspaper combination, ultimately absorbing or destroying all its rivals, would be a fatal blow at the freedom of the Press. I do not see the force of this. The Press would be raised to so commanding a position that its freedom would be greater than ever. One must remember that the freedom of the Press does not mean a license to say what we please, or to do whatever we like; but a freedom from outside interference or censorship. In my opinion, the party journals of the present day possess far less freedom than the simultaneous newspapers of the twentieth century will enjoy.

Let me repeat, however, that I am not advocating newspaper monopolies. I am only pointing out that they are practicable, and will probably soon become important factors in journalistic life.

I am profoundly hopeful of the future. I am convinced that the Press has its best days to come. Already, it is in touch with the people to an extent never attained before. Already, its influence has spread into the secret council chamber, as well as into the laborer's cottage. Already, it is leaving behind what is effete and antiquated, and is keeping step with the march of a progressive age. Already, it is casting off the domination of party and the serfdom of tradition, and has set its face steadfastly toward the light. And to this advance—a happy forecast of even better things to come—the enterprising and enlightened Press of America has contributed in no mean measure.

Journalism, though but a thing of yesterday, now overshadows the earth. The old Norse fable of the tree Ygdrasil, on whose leaves were written the scenes of the life of man, has been said to find a kind of fulfilment in the rustle of the myriad leaves of the world's Press, unfolded afresh every morning.

For good or ill, I believe its trend to be in the direction I have indicated, though it is unlikely that the complete newspaper monopoly will arise in the earlier end of the new century.

ALFRED HARMSWORTH.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE POLITICAL SITUATION IN GREAT BRITAIN.

BY THE DUKE OF ARGYLL.

"WE'RE going to form a Government of Examination and Enquiry," were the words used by the statesman who was called in 1886 to face the demand of the Irish Nationalists for a separate national Parliament. For some time before, he had been considered by his friends as "leaning toward Home Rule." The word has become nauseous, not only on account of the long political battle which has raged ever since as to the result of the policy signified by the phrase, but also on account of the doubt of what the phrase itself meant. Whether it meant management of district gas and water, or political separation founded on fancied lines of racial division; whether it was only a strictly guarded devolution of central power, or a surrender to men who hated that Government, none knew. All was conjecture.

It is necessary to go back fifteen years, to know how and why it is that a Government formed not on a conjectural platform, but one of tried and substantial planks, is in office. It is a Government not only in office, but in power, and with such power as has not been given before to any in England. Never before has a majority of 150 in the House of Commons followed the Government Whips' requests for five years. Never before has that majority, on an appeal to the polls, been sent back with power and purpose undiminished.

This is the consequence of that dubious phrase of 1886, "We're going to form a Government of Examination and Enquiry." Examination and enquiry into what? Into that which all men who had given any study to politics knew already perfectly well. There had been no manner of doubt as to what the Irish separatists demanded. "The narrow sea forbids Legislative Union with England; the ocean forbids Separation," was the most

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

friendly utterance toward England repeated by any responsible Irish Nationalist. But the majority declared they would have nothing but an Ireland ruled only by its own Parliament. It had been an ill-used nation in the past. It would be an ill-used nation now, if not allowed to have the laws of property and finance and representation altered to the views of the leaders of the Irish Democracy. The eighty Nationalist or separatist votes at Westminster would always be used to enforce the claim. It was only a question of time when an English statesman would be at the head of affairs with a precarious majority, and then the eighty votes "cast solid" must tell, and he must capitulate.

In 1886, they thought they had already found the man who would surrender. True, he had spoken all his life against such capitulation. But he was known to be imperious enough to desire power at the cost of surrender. Conscious of an almost divine purpose in all he did, why should it not be possible to convert himself, and England, to attempt that which surpassed the wit of man, and unite by disintegration? It only required enough time and enough talk! Would a separate House of Commons at Dublin crystallize antagonism? "Well, they say not—they say not." And so the great conjecture became in his mind the great, the almost divine, experiment. His friends, indeed, doubted, although it was almost blasphemy to doubt where he drove. To them came the words, "Examine and enquire. We're going to form a Government of Examination and Enquiry. We need not approach the Irish question for another year. A twelvemonth hence—next January!" And many followed into the darkness, groping and clinging to words, and believed in the twelve months' respite from embracing that which they and their chief had denounced through long years of patriotic verbiage. Oh, vanity of human, and even of Parliamentary, experts' "judgment"! Twelve months! No—in three months they had to swallow their principles, and produce their proposals to meet the demands of sedition!

That is what has ruled the situation ever since. It rules it now, although the immediate future is again shrouded in examination and enquiry. But the quest is now more for a new Leader, with an equal amount of indecision and an equal amount of captivating phrase. Several try the game of satisfaction of the eye or ear. Loud, sonorous music is played, and dexterous dancing

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

over the naked swords of difficulty is indulged in; and, like the dancer over the blades, great care is taken that not a little toe shall come into contact with realities. When rhetoric has done its work, in forming a party of enthusiastic generalizers, it will be time to "examine and enquire" into any policy which may be taken up. Some politicians are only happy, if, like the sea, they take any color that storm or sun may give to the sky above.

Men say that political memory is short; but it was impossible even for the most casual and careless to forget that these men had only been "Liberal" in the direction of constituting Ireland a separate nationality, at the end of lifetimes devoted to combating the Nationalist Irish claim. It was seen at once that the act was done for continued power, though cloaked in every fine phrase that could be drawn from the resources of casuistry and passion. It made England think that the party which could so surrender their convictions could not govern.

And it is to this idea, false or well-founded, that the strength of the Conservatives is due. Britain is at a time when men are required who can govern and know their own mind. The progress made in the expansion of the Empire through increase of trade, and the pushing of our people into new regions, has made it apparent that there must be no divided counsels allowed at home in speaking with those without the gate. The most intense jealousy and dislike have been nourished in foreign lands against us by the very fact of our successes. When their merchants have desired to push the protected trade of foreign countries, they have constantly found that the Union Jack had been carried to the places of vantage they desired to possess, and the free trade triple cross had found more favor than the tricolor bars. The best ports, the most coveted coaling stations, were already under the Union Jack. Somehow, also, though trade was subsidized by enormous grants from the foreign treasuries, and foreign capital and foreign flags were carried far, yet there was no flesh and blood behind these symbols. The men did not care to become colonists. If they went to countries beyond seas, it was not to carry with them their own laws and institutions and language, but to become Americans or Britishers, to speak English, and gradually to become citizens of Anglo-Saxon states or colonies. This fact alone is sufficient to account for much of the exasperation against England which one hears so often rising from the foreign press.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In private life, the poor do not care for millionaires who only use their riches to become yet richer. This was the rôle ascribed to Britain. The emigrants from the Continent go to her colonies, become rich in the commercial life of the Anglo-Saxon communities, and in a generation or two forget that they are Germans, or Dutch, or Swedes, or Norsemen, and, becoming naturalized, are lost to the lands of their fathers. Canadian Frenchmen have a sentimental feeling for old France, but their laws and institutions which they cherish, and which are secured to them in the Province of Quebec, are not the laws and institutions of modern France. Their richer citizens may revisit the places in Brittany and Normandy from which their fathers came, and may be attracted to Paris, but the language alone is like that they know as their own. The habits of the people, the genius of the centralized France which has absorbed the old Home Rule provinces of the north, or of Provence, or of Burgundy, or La Vendée, is quite different. Except in the Provinces separate of old, little of the religion they love is respected in the France of to-day. Canada is Catholic, loyalist, and peculiar. Modern France lives mostly apart from the Church, is all stamped with the Paris stamp, and responds to the feelings of a capital which has thrown off all monarchical ideas, all reverence for the past, and most of the fertilizing affection for laws that has made Canada prosperous, populous and reverent. It is not England who has known how to colonize, for her Government by its folly lost her greatest colonies in the United States. But it is the blended race inhabiting the British Isles which has known how to colonize, because, at home strong in freedom and populous with strength, it has spread wherever sail or steam could carry its sons, bearing with them the old love for the old laws, which were wrested from kings, and also from the Commonwealth of Cromwell.

This is the secret of the seeming miracle which has "painted the world red," and it is natural that envy and covetousness and the rivalry of governments should combine to dislike it, and to pour forth treasure in the attempt to do the like. It is not treasure, however, but the freedom of laws, that makes successful colonies, destined in time to be nations strong as the mother land.

Now, in this again, the men who became indifferent to Union under Legislature at home were found wanting in appreciation of the significance of their own extended Empire. Even Disraeli,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as a young man, caught the infection of indifference; but only for a moment. The burden of Empire, the cost of responsibility for those who seemed sometimes ungrateful for the protection accorded to them, the taxation involved in the maintenance of fleets bound to defend hundreds of thousands of miles of coast, far from England, weighed on these British politicians. How well I remember one of the most eminent of them asking, with some scorn, when a request involving some outlay was preferred, "Why, what is Canada—not 2,000,000 of people?" Yet this statesman had served at the head of the Colonial Office. He seemed not to have taken the trouble to look at Canadian progress since the time of his service, and remembered only the number of the population of that date, while it had grown from his recollection of two million to close upon five million.

The feeling among these politicians of the first half of the Queen's reign was practically this: "Let us, as soon as we may, get these expensive colonies to 'cut the painter' and shift for themselves. Why should our Budgets be weighted by their necessities?" It was the hand-to-mouth policy, the policy of the good of the moment only, which many believe to be the feature of democratic government. And yet, now that the Government of Great Britain is becoming hourly and daily more democratic, there is less of this sentiment observable than of old, when old Whigs and old Tories alike were becoming impatient of the expense of our children. To be sure, strength breeds respect, and a desire for friendship. But, when the young communities could give back little, it was natural that the parent land should sometimes grumble. Yet, in the main, the old land held by the younger. Some may think this came because the democracy was not able fully to assert the short-sighted interest of the day over the more abiding interests of the future. It may be difficult to persuade the "toiling masses" that any insurance for the future of the nation should come out of their pockets. Where men have little to spend, they wish their taxes to purchase immediate benefit. It is difficult for most governments to make the constituencies realize that distant lands have much in common with themselves, and that what seems a resultless expense to-day may prove to be money well laid out in a future unknown and conjectural. But the safety England has experienced against this danger of exclusion, selfishness and folly came from her own people. They

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

knew, in every hamlet and city, of the lives of their sons and brothers who had gone to the lands which now, as British Colonies, demanded sympathy, protection and union. Voltaire was a learned man who had seen men and cities. Yet he contemptuously spoke of the French American possessions as "a few acres of snow." What use was that to France? he asked. If he had been an Englishman with a family, some of whom had become pioneers in America, he would have known better. The English did know better. Where there was British blood, there was the ever-enduring British bond. And so, over the learning of the wise and the misgivings of clever politicians, prevailed the wider knowledge, born of the Imperial instincts of the people. They knew that their children's states were to them so much money at credit to be called in "against a rainy day." They even had forbearance with a British weakness shown by the younger peoples, a weakness strangely enough born of their own strength. This was the tendency to be unprepared for war. It was the fault of placing too great a confidence in themselves, and believing that when they exerted themselves it would be sufficient to place untrained British levies against the more highly trained forces of other countries. That is a most dangerous fault, which England has not now outgrown, and which is painfully apparent among her sons over sea. They may, one and all, have to pay most dearly for it. It has been illustrated very recently both in the United States and in England. One of the vast benefits of recent wars is that they have largely tended to dissipate this fault and folly.

It is a curious accident, but it has its significance, that the last "Liberal" Government owed its fall to the unpreparedness of the War Office in the matter of warlike stores. The supplies have been ridiculously inadequate, owing to the parsimony of the Treasury. Each War Minister in turn, no matter of what party, could have got the House of Commons to vote the money for whatever he declared to be necessary. But the "false shame" of shrinking from embarrassing colleagues by asking too much of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, or of demanding what at all events might seem too much, has influenced successive ministers at the head of the Military, and, to a lesser degree, also, at the head of the Naval Department. The constant changes in ordnance, owing to the rapidity with which invention succeeded invention, has hin-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG.
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dered ministers at the head of these departments for national defense from recommending the use of vast sums on weapons which another year might render obsolete. There has not been in England the perpetual likelihood of imminent war which has kept Continental nations up to date in these matters. Take, for instance, the case of the so-called Creusot guns, lately used by the Boers. Those guns were made by Manchester machinery, offered to the British Government, declined by them, and then sold to the Schneider-Canet Company of Creusot, and resold by them to the Boers. The Boers knew how to use them by paying for Dutch, German and French artillerymen; and they have given the British a most valuable lesson in the mobility of guns which are classed by artillerymen of the English army as "guns of position." But the British artillery was good, having been brought "up to date," and was able to hold its own with guns of its own class. It was in the stores of ammunition for all guns and in the lack of movable guns of position that the British weakness lay. Now, for this the tone of the party which believes that it can get on without any warfare, except that which it may wage at home against the wealthier classes, is to blame in the first degree. Their opponents are also to blame, in a less degree, because it is not from their own ranks that opposition to war votes and money votes usually arises. "Whenever the Tory party are in for a few years," say the Liberals, "taxes increase, because wars come." It is the standing gibe of their platforms. To meet this, the Conservatives have not always been able to harden their hearts against a false economy. The Navy, in this last war, was supplied with the proper amount of ammunition, and with good guns. The Army had good guns, but only of one class, and very little ammunition. We may confess this now that the danger is past, and the thanks of Britain are due to Mr. Krüger and Co. for giving us so useful an object lesson. Never in our generation, and probably for a much longer time, will England have to go begging every firm of founders to work night and day to supply projectiles and ammunition of all sorts.

Whether the war will make any change in administrative rules, in regard to allowing the nation to know the wants of the Navy or Army by other channels than those of the civil representatives of the services in the Cabinet, is another matter. The press, and the professional soldiers and sailors, are always anxious to have

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the supply of all arms sufficient. But the official mouthpieces of Fleet and Army are the First Lord of the Admiralty and the Secretary of State for War—civilians both of them—who have struggled through a political campaign with the First Lord of the Treasury, and have a fellow feeling with him in his difficulties in calling on the Chancellor of the Exchequer to provide sums which will be objected to by the Opposition in the House of Commons. It is not easy to justify increased armaments, unless there be a war or a war scare. The Military and Naval people who are in office are not in power. They must remain dumb, and be represented or misrepresented by the politicians. They have only one resource, and that is to resign, which requires far more courage than what is to them a trifle, namely the facing of the fire of an enemy. A Naval Lord or Commander-in-Chief must be a very convinced person before he makes up his mind to become by resignation a very impecunious one. Besides, if he did make a martyr of himself, would he do any good? Would the public understand him, and follow him? Would he not be only sacrificing himself and amusing the public and his opponents? If the politician placed in office above him says there is enough preparation against an enemy, and he says there is not, would not the politician have most weight, and his sacrifice be rendered vain? The professional sailors at the Admiralty have more chance than have the professional soldiers at the War Office, because the sailors form a board of experts, who have to be consulted, if not obeyed, and their resignation *en masse* would produce an impression on the public. But at the War Office there is no Consultative Board of soldiers, and each military expert is carefully locked up in his own pigeon-hole, whence he is expected only to coo as the Secretary of State desires. It is a question, in regard to such paramount national interests as those of defense, whether it should not be permissible for a unanimous expression of the opinion of the professional men in both Admiralty and War Office to be made public through some channel other than the mouth of the Parliamentary representative of the Department. If the politician disagreed, he could still say so, and advance reasons besides the mere question of cost, against the spending of the money advised by the professional representatives at the Offices as necessary for national exigencies. In the United States, there is the President to decide between politicians and the service men. In Germany,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

there is the Emperor. In Russia, there is the Czar. In Britain, there is nothing, not even a scandal!

The British public cannot know if it be in danger or not, except—and this is a large exception—except for the opinions of men of mark recorded in the press. This is a good but slowly acting medicine, and the effect of press censure may come too late. Official reticence may prevent the press from knowing the truth. Editors cannot always be investigating ammunition boxes.

The mighty wave of warlike enthusiasm which swept over the Empire when it was seen that foreign intrigue, reactionary ignorance and oligarchical exclusiveness had challenged British institutions in South Africa, has filled the ranks, so that 250,000 men have been put under arms at the Cape, and all the barracks in Great Britain are bursting with red coats, anxious to change their scarlet for khaki for service at the front. All the important colonies have contributed to this array in Africa. The Government boast that such a thing has never been done before, that this sending of over 200,000 men seven thousand miles from Scotland to Lydenberg is a feat unequalled in the history of warfare. So it is. But rather accidentally. We have had the advantage of a free sea, an unopposed landing, excellent harbors, and a time of peace and successful commerce, when any "tramp" ship was certain to arrive at her destination, and there was less difficulty in shipping eight or ten Army Corps to the Cape than there was at the time of the Peninsular War in sending a thousand men to Lisbon. This immunity from annoyance in shipping troops cannot always be depended on. What may be depended on is the constant help of the colonies, so long as the war that excites their desire to aid the mother country is a war like this war, a struggle to put down antagonism to the free institutions on which they are determined to have the Empire founded, if there is to be an Empire at all. Cunning and contempt of their neighbors may have been exhibited in connection with ignorance and dogged bravery before these qualities were shown by the Boers. But these qualities must, it is felt by all free English communities, be licked into another shape, if they are to be of service to the world at large. There is a considerable section of the British Liberal party audible at all elections who hate all war, and this war in particular; and yet you find that the very men who go out and away from England with these ideas, and voyage to South Africa,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

come back or write back recanting all their former opinions. Judging on the spot, they see that there was no other course but to resist the Boer invasion of the British Colonies, and that there is no other means of insuring peace and diffusion of education and freedom to whites and blacks, but the ending of the cause of the outbreak—that is, the ending of the separate, backward nationalities sought to be made strong by the discovery of the gold mines, and to be fostered in antagonism to English and American institutions. But the party hostile to the war, and who are unable to see its necessity, will remain wringing their hands at their own people, and extending the same hands to take those of the enemy, in spite of all demonstration of the falsity of the sentiment they cherish. The same men will always protest against "bloated armaments" at home, and they will resist, as far as they can, any taxation of the people for the maintenance of a good army capable of holding its own against an enemy landed in England. Their opposition is not to be despised, for we all believe in the fleet, which is supposed to be not only invincible but omniscient. It is probable that they would not be pleased if the Colonies took in future the same view, and regarded their contribution to the Navy as quite sufficient, in case of any threatened maritime combination against England. Britain, if she keeps up a fleet equal to any two of her rivals, cannot keep up a fleet equal to three or four other fleets combined. We have had combinations against us as strong. We have new combinations of Science, as well as of multitudes, to consider, as forces to be possibly arrayed against us. We must only work so that if such combinations are made, we may also combine with our Anglo-Saxon kinsfolk, to keep alive our power and our prolific gospel of the expansion of free laws and popular government.

Whether such cohesion and common appearance in arms will be effectual in securing sufficient numbers to enforce these principles of freedom, when challenged by really powerful enemies, is a very difficult question to determine. We have no reason to doubt that the Anglo-Saxon peoples can enforce these views, if they are determined to do so. Each year strengthens them in population and in resource. The weakness Britain and other Anglo-Saxon peoples equally show in the want of the trained men without whom an army is a mob, is being slowly remedied "at home." New batteries of artillery are being formed. Heavier armaments

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are being placed in forts. The cavalry is by no means adequate. Transport and commissariat for all but a handful of regulars are sadly wanting. We can look only on the Navy among our forces as being really "fit." But if it can do anything, it cannot go everywhere. It is probable that we must tax those who desire a life of ease, and who, although physically fit, will not give any time to training in any of the armed forces of the country. Each party meanwhile shuns proposing anything which may be called, however remotely, by the name of conscription. We still want a really good scare to enable us to possess an effective army in the modern meaning of the word. "*Non Angli, sed Angeli,*" may be said of any Government which shall do this without the help of a scare. But here again, as on so many points vital to national existence, it is not the party now discarded by the constituencies who are the likeliest ever to be regarded as Britain's guardian angels.

British relations toward Continental Powers are less threatened by any Government that leaves the peculiarities of these Powers alone and "takes them as they come," than by one which fusses because they are not like ourselves, as was often the case under less prudent administrations, which characterized one people as "unspeakable," and another by language which had to be withdrawn and apologized for.

The Eloquence of Denunciation is a danger. Indeed, too great eloquence in any responsible statesman is a perilous luxury. It delights the audience, thrills for a moment the public, and then, like even the best whiskey, is apt to be succeeded by a chill which is the penance for the passing exhilaration. The greatest orators are usually the worst political guides. Judgment is necessary for affairs. A man who has enough imagination to be supremely eloquent is not in a condition to have his judgment firmly seated. His own phrases, struck from burning indignation or its imitation, have too extended a reach. If taken seriously, the praise or dispraise exalts or abases in a degree which becomes in practice outrageous. The majesty of perspective is lost in the intoxication of phrase and passion. The speaker who sways a crowd with the melody of his sentences is too apt to have none of his sweet notes for the equal scales of Justice. His burning words may be good to incite to war, or during a contest, but are not of the essence of that economy in all things which is desired

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by good Liberals. Luckily, we have now scarcely any rhetoricians. We have many business men on both sides, especially if lawyers may be considered men of business. Our orators are laudably dull. Our good talkers are in the ascendant.

Will the great majorities last—or for how long? Who can tell? The side represented by the vast majority of to-day is the same side that was represented by the vast majority of the last five years. It means union. It means no Separatist nonsense, and yet it has not interfered with the machinery of separation. It has not proposed to cut down the representation of the Irish secessionists by one vote, although they now have a ridiculous disproportion to the population represented respectively by English and Irish members. A Nationalist obstructs all proceedings of the House in the name of five hundred illiterates. An Englishman may represent 50,000 intelligent people, and is of no more weight than the Nationalist. Can such disproportion continue? The Union Government has not interfered with it. When the legislature of Ireland was merged with that of England, the representation was arranged on the basis of respective population in each country. This has all changed, and Irish Nationalists boast that, whereas at the time of the Legislative Union no British constituency could be influenced by Irish votes, now over thirty can be turned any way by the Separatist leaders. The conditions have totally changed, and yet the Nationalists are allowed to be "cock of the dunghill" at home, and to rule thirty British dunghills as well. What patience on the part of the Unionists!

Again, in the matter of social legislation, taxes on succession to property have been raised, so that men who paid £5,000 have now to pay from £40,000 to £45,000, and country gentlemen cannot live in their houses or give the same employment as before; and yet nothing of all this has been repealed by the Unionist Chancellor of the Exchequer. On the contrary, social legislation is all against capital, all in favor of labor, whether that means a withdrawal of that capital on which labor must exist, or not. Only at general pensions to all men and women at sixty-five does the Union Government hesitate. Trade flourishes. Revenue and Empire grow. But there are not enough trained white men to defend them on land, or to man the ships built to guard them by sea.

ARGYLL.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE NEW POWER IN THE SOUTH PACIFIC.

BY HUGH H. LUSK.

THE establishment of the United States of Australia, under the novel title of "The Australian Commonwealth," is one of those events of history the importance of which is apt to be overlooked by most persons at the time they occur. It is natural that many should fancy that a political change occurring among a people occupying a distant country, directly connected with no other country, and not themselves what is known as an independent nation, can be of little moment to the rest of the world. In the case of Australia, such an idea is a mistaken one. The past history of the colonies now federated as one people; the relation which they occupy, and must continue to occupy, to the rest of the British Empire; the nature, position, and wealth of the great island continent which they have all to themselves; all tend to show that, in the advent of a United Australia, both England and the rest of the world have to do with a new power in the Pacific, whose influence must be increasingly felt within a very few years.

The nation of four million inhabitants just established in the continent of the South Pacific is, with the single exception of New Zealand, the youngest of the nations. Eighty years ago, it did not exist at all. Seventy years ago, it existed only as a handful of adventurers, set down beside a penal settlement, where something like twenty thousand banished criminals were expiating their offenses against society. Fifty years ago, it was a pastoral community, whose flocks were scattered widely over the fringe of an unexplored country, supposed by most people to be a vast desert, and looked upon, even by its own little band of pioneers, as only fit for growing sheep and cattle, free to roam over its wide plains. To-day, it is a people, small in numbers,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

even now, when compared with the size of its territory, but energetic, enterprising, ambitious, and already wealthy beyond the experience of other countries or the dreams of most other nations. They have occupied the belt of land that encircles their continental island over a coast line of eight thousand miles; they have penetrated and explored the great interior plains of the country, till they have everywhere ascertained its general character; they have established agriculture suited to its varied climates; they have discovered and developed mineral treasures hardly surpassed in richness elsewhere in the world; they have opened harbors large enough to contain the navies of the world; they have built cities that rival most of those to be found in the oldest countries. It is no exaggeration to say that the achievements of the people of Australia in the last seventy years are unsurpassed by those of almost any other nation.

That they have owed much to their position goes almost without saying. Had it not been for the fostering care of the parent country—truly, a Mother Country to the younger members of her family—such steady and unchecked progress as theirs would have been impossible. Had it not been for her judicious control of their affairs in the earliest stages of their development, and for her equally judicious withdrawal from all interference with the management of their internal concerns, when they became ready and willing to manage them on their own account, they could never have adapted themselves to their conditions or developed their resources as they have done. But for the fact of their isolation in a continent that was all their own, too far from all other countries to be acted on by other peoples, too remote to be in any danger from their interference, it is hardly possible that they could have prospered as they have done, and quite impossible that they could have developed, as a people, the traits of national character likely at no distant period to render them important in the comity of nations. What her insular position has been to England, in assisting her expansion and determining her character, that, if not something more than that, it will probably be found hereafter, her continental isolation has been to Australia.

It must be remembered that there is nothing, except the single feature of isolation, in common between Great Britain and Australia. Indeed, it would be hard to find, on the face of the globe, two habitable countries that had less in common between

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

them either in climate or conditions of life. Whether the men who went there took up pastoral pursuits, as nearly everybody did in the earlier stages of colonization; or turned to gold mining and the many other employments that followed in its train, as everybody did in the second period; they found nothing to remind them of the country or the life they had left behind them in the little islands of the northern seas. They had brought with them the doggedly determined spirit which had been trained in the long centuries of England's slow growth, the adventurous temper which had taken her sons into every corner of the globe and made them the world's great pioneers of settlement, the heritage of equal laws and the instinct of self-government, which has enabled them everywhere to adapt themselves to circumstances or to compel circumstances to obey them. It was with these endowments that a mere handful of men undertook, something like seventy years ago, to exploit a continent and to build up a nation. It must be admitted that they have proved equal to the task. The story of Australian exploration has been written mainly by the hands of those who were the most active in the work, and no more remarkable record of human endurance can be found in the annals of any country.

At the moment of their consolidation into a united commonwealth, the people of Australia find themselves, man for man, the wealthiest of any nation in the world. They are in the unquestioned possession of a continental island, rich in land fit for settlement and industry, of every kind practiced in almost any part of the world by men of the race from which nearly all of them have sprung. They have already laid the foundations of a national prosperity dependent on no single product or industry, but embracing pastoral, agricultural and mining industries in almost equal degree; to which are rapidly being added manufactures of the kinds most suited to the circumstances of the country. Last year, the total value of the products of the colonies now forming the Commonwealth amounted to fully $550,000,000, of which their pastoral industries represented fully $150,000,000, their agriculture $140,000,000, their mineral products fully $100,000,000, and their manufacturing and other industries the remainder. This production was the fruit of the industry of a people numbering less than four million souls, and it therefore represents a sum of one hundred and thirty-seven dollars for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

every inhabitant of the country: a sum which is probably twice as great as that representing the average earnings in any European nation, and at least half as great again as that in even this country.

And, in each of the departments of Australia's industry, there seems to be room for an expansion which is, practically, almost boundless. The hundred and twenty millions of sheep, whose wool alone was last year worth nearly $100,000,000 in the markets of the world, occupy but a small proportion of the country known to be suitable for their support; and that country can, it is said, be enormously extended by the boring of artesian wells, tapping the vast underground reservoir of water which runs inland from the rainy districts of the coast, and underlies the central plains of the continent. The whole of the coastal districts, extending about eight thousand miles, by a width of at least one hundred and fifty miles, are suitable for agriculture—some of it the agriculture of temperate climates, the wheat, and corn, vines and fruit trees we know so well; some the rice and sugar, the tobacco and cotton, of the tropical zone. The land is generally rich, the rainfall in the coastal belt is abundant, and, strange to say, even the most tropical districts are not affected by malaria nor unhealthy for people of European race. The mineral resources of Australia are not even guessed as yet. In the last forty-eight years, the country has produced gold to the value of about $1,800,000,000; in the last twenty, silver to the value of $150,000,000. Iron, copper, tin, lead, antimony, have been found in rich deposits in many parts of the continent, and are being worked in a few, with results out of all proportion to expectation elsewhere; and coal, of every known kind, extends in vast beds through districts spreading over thousands of square miles both on the eastern and western coasts, while millions of tons are being exported, year by year in greater quantities, to India and Southern China on the one hand, and to North and South America on the other. And yet, as we have already said, the mineral wealth of Australia is but vaguely guessed at. The richest discoveries of gold and iron and coal yet made in West Australia have been made on the extreme fringe of the great unknown land, as yet untrodden by the feet of white men; the great coal fields lately found in Queensland stretch back, apparently unbroken, into the unexplored districts, known in the ex-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pressive language of the country as "The Never-Never Lands." Diamonds are found in one district, rubies in another; there is at least one emerald mine in New South Wales; and opals, equal to any in the world, are found in Queensland, while the pearl fisheries of the northwestern coast produce a considerable proportion of the most valued pearls of commerce.

We have thus glanced very cursorily at the history of the development of Australia; we have said something of its present wealth, and hinted at its vast reserve of wealth, which necessarily remains as yet rather guessed at than definitely ascertained. It remains that we should say something of the present position of the Commonwealth in relation to Great Britain, before we can form any reasonably certain forecast of the results that are likely to follow upon the establishment of the new Federation.

At the present time, the colonies forming the Commonwealth are the most valuable to England of any part of her great possessions. It is not merely that she has invested vast sums of money in Australia, in the shape of loans, both public and private, from which she derives a great annual return as interest, although the principal thus invested amounts to rather more than $1,500,000,000, and the annual interest to fully $72,000,000. In addition to this—and even more important than this—is the fact that England finds in Australia at present her best customer for the goods she produces, and, with the single exception of India, among all her possessions, quite her largest supplier with the raw material which she manufactures. Last year England exported to Australia manufactured goods to the value of about $118,000,000, and received from the colonies now forming the Commonwealth the raw material for her manufactures of various kinds worth very nearly $150,000,000. India, which is still of all her possessions the largest customer for her goods, imported goods from England to the value of fully $156,000,000; but she only sent goods to Great Britain—and those to a large extent manufactured goods, and therefore less profitable—to the value of $136,000,000. Thus the total trade during 1899 between England and India was about $295,000,000, and that between England and Australia about $270,000,000. The total export of India to all foreign countries in 1898 was valued at about a billion of dollars, while that of Australia was valued at only $630,000,000; but the trade of India with Britain only represented three-tenths

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of her whole trade, while that of Australia did not fall very far short of one-half of hers.

And if the new Commonwealth is compared with any other British possession, the contrast in her favor becomes much more remarkable. The case which suggests itself most naturally for comparison is, of course, that of the Dominion of Canada, both on account of its being, like Australia, an aggregation of colonies, and because it more nearly resembles the southern Federation in size, population, and circumstances, than any section of the empire. In the Dominion of Canada, England has a dependency with a population which probably exceeds that of united Australia, at the opening of the new century, by something like 1,400,000 persons. The total area of the Dominion is one-fifth greater than that of Australia. The colonies of which it is formed have—so far as all but one or two are concerned—been founded for a period more than twice as long as the colonial existence of Australia. In spite of all these facts, it is easy to show that even now the Dominion is of far less value to Great Britain commercially, and holds out a vastly less extensive promise of expansion to England's trade in any direction, than the Pacific Commonwealth. The total trade of Canada, to begin with, falls immensely short of that of Australia; for, while in 1897 all the foreign trade of the Dominion amounted in value only to a trifle more than $275,000,000, of which England secured less than one-third, the foreign trade of Australia in the same year was valued at more than $560,000,000, nearly one-half of which went to England.

The case of South Africa indicates the same results even in a more marked degree; as, even before the political events arose which have, no doubt, arrested the development of trade most seriously for the time, the trade of South Africa was insignificant when compared with that of Australia. It is also practically certain that it will continue to be so, even should a period of prosperity follow the war. The possession of gold and diamonds in rich deposits is, indeed, the only thing which can obscure the fact that a united South Africa can never compare, either as a field for settlement or a producer of wealth, with a country like Australia. And, even in this respect, it is too soon to assert that South Africa will long take precedence of Australia. The gold production of Australia, if less sensational than that of the Rand

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mines during the last year or two, is, and has for half a century been, a great and, generally, a steady one. Her gold-fields already known to exist are spread over nearly every part of the continent, while they have only been fairly tested in a few districts, and exhausted in none. Her precious stones are far more varied than those of South Africa, and even of diamonds, more than 170,000 carats in weight have been exported from New South Wales within the last twelve years. What the future may have in store, either for South Africa or Australia, in the way of new discoveries of gold or gems, it is, of course, impossible to foresee; but, as far as present indications go, there is no reason to suppose that, even in those exceptional productions, the new Commonwealth is destined to be left permanently behind, while in every other she must, in the future as in the past, assert an easy superiority.

From a consideration of these facts, attested as they are by the irresistible logic of the statistics of years, it becomes evident not only that, at the moment of her entry on a political career as a united Commonwealth, Australia is by far the most wealthy and progressive of all the groups of British colonies in any part of the world, but also that, more than any other, she shares that wealth through the channels of trade with England. Already the trade of her four millions of inhabitants with Great Britain is nearly as great as that of India's hundreds of millions, and more than twice as large as that of the five and a half millions of Canada. The prospect, also, of its expansion during the first ten years of the new century are far better than in either of the other cases. Good government may, indeed, increase India's production; but there are a thousand risks from without and from within that may interfere with, or wholly prevent, any expansion of her trade with England. Prosperity in an increasing degree may, indeed, attend Canada; but it is natural, and indeed inevitable, that the United States, rather than England, will reap the principal advantage. Peace and development may come to South Africa; but there is every evidence that, at the very best, she has not the material advantages necessary to any successful competition with Australia, either as a field for Anglo-Saxon settlement, or as a rapidly improving market for English commerce.

There is, besides this, a still stronger reason why the influence of United Australia should in the future greatly exceed that of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

any other part of the British Empire in its influence on England's policy, and thereby on the future of the world's development and progress. The people of Great Britain and Australia are all one people. It is true that their circumstances and conditions are very different, and eventually differences of character will follow; but so far, at any rate, the peoples are one. They are united by the same language, laws, religion, customs and traditions; and, if there is any difference, it will be found in this—that the Australian people are more enthusiastic Britons than the people who have never left the ancestral home of the race. Nothing could have proved this more clearly than the events of the last fifteen months in connection with South Africa. Strangers, especially Continental strangers, were astonished and impressed by the spectacle of peoples who were not involved in the quarrel between England and the Republics of South Africa, and had not been consulted as to the policy pursued, coming voluntarily forward to offer their sons and their money as a contribution to England's success in the war. In this, indeed, Australia, even with the addition of New Zealand, did not stand alone. The government of Canada and a part, at any rate, of her people joined in the movement, and sent men and gave money to the cause. But there was a difference, which is perhaps hardly appreciated in this or any other country except England herself, between the assistance given by Australasia and that given by either Canada or South Africa to her cause. In the case of the Dominion, help was offered and given to the cause of the Empire, but it was not given without a jarring note of opposition and hesitation; and there was no general enthusiasm for the cause. In the case of Cape Colony and Natal, help was given by one part, and that the smaller part, of the people, to a cause which they felt involved their own freedom and future existence—and it was offset by still larger, and equally enthusiastic, support given to the opposite side. In Australia, alone of the three, there was undivided enthusiasm for the cause. Money and men were freely offered by each one of the colonies, and the offer was as freely repeated when more help seemed to be wanted. Each reverse was met by a stern exhibition of determination to do their part to bring success out of failure, and each victory was hailed with a popular enthusiasm not exceeded in England itself. Australia lent more than twice as many of her sons to the cause as Canada did, and three times as many in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

proportion to her population; and she was always ready to give more, had they been needed. To-day she has troops in China, and one, at least, of her naval coast-defense ships is in Chinese waters, as a contribution to the defense of British interests.

We have thus seen something of the position of the new Commonwealth of Australia at the moment of its entry on a united career. We have seen that it possesses a continent, less in area than any other, but second to none in wealth, or in the prospects of wealth; we have seen, also, that its people are already rich beyond other peoples, and that they share, to a far greater extent than any other part even of her own Empire, their trade and commerce with the mother country. It is evident, also, that, beyond any other of her great possessions, Australia can be relied on by England to sympathize with her in any difficulty, and to support her to the utmost with men and money. These things are understood by the mother country, and their importance is fully appreciated, as was made evident when the British Parliament passed with enthusiasm an Act to give the force of law to a Constitution framed entirely by the Australian people themselves, and securing to them a degree of independence never before given to any part of the British, or indeed of any other, Empire. The question which naturally arises is, What may be looked for as the result of the new departure in the political framework of the Empire?

Two results, at least, would seem to be somewhat more than probable, within a comparatively short period. The Australian people are, as has been said already, an energetic and an ambitious people. The moving force which brought about federation was not so much any internal need, or any fear of possible interference from the outside which might demand a united defense, as a desire to have a greater voice in the councils of the Empire—if not directly and avowedly, at any rate really and potentially. Her people's imperial enthusiasm is partly one of natural sympathy, but it is also, in part, caused by the feeling that she has a greater place and career before her as an influential part of a great Empire than she could have as an independent nation. Those who know Australia best will have the least doubt that she will find means, ere long, to use that influence for purposes beneficial to herself. Her people were far from pleased with what was done in the case of Samoa; and it is safe to say that no such

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

policy of concession will ever command the assent of United Australia. The sphere of her first interests will, for the present, be confined mainly to the Pacific and Indian Oceans to the south of the equator. She will be interested in the Loyalty group, where France is established, and in the New Hebrides, where she is very anxious to establish herself. She will be solicitous about the Solomon islands, part of which are at present recognized as German territory; and she will take a very deep interest in the future of New Guinea, part of which belongs to Germany, and the rest, beyond the British section, is understood to form part of Holland's great but little used estate in the eastern Archipelago. These will undoubtedly be Australia's first cares, but she will not be content with these for very long. Siam, French and Southern China, and Borneo, are natural marts for her trade, which in the next ten years will be a rapidly increasing one; and, in relation to all these, she will expect to exercise large influence.

Upon such activities as these only one of two things can follow: United Australia must take part in—must almost certainly become the moving spirit in—the formation of a system of imperial federation which shall give her, and all other sections of the self-governing Empire, a formal and recognized voice in imperial policy, linked with a definite and recognized share in the cost of empire; or she must retire from the Empire altogether. England would sacrifice much to prevent such a contingency as the latter; and there can hardly be a doubt that Australia will be very easily persuaded to select such a destiny as the first would seem to hold out. The wish for the inauguration of some such federation is strong in the minds of British statesmen already; but they are wise in their decision to leave it to the other parts of the Empire to propose it. So far, it has commanded no very great attention, and no enthusiasm at all, in Australia; but the events of the last fifteen months have done much to advance the cause. It will need but a little experience of the ambition of United Australia to convince England that it is pressingly required; and it will demand but a very few years of Australia's wider political horizon to convince her people that she must regard the federation of her colonies as only the first step to the larger union of the Empire, in which she will undoubtedly prove a very important factor.

HUGH H. LUSK.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SUBSTITUTES FOR SHIP SUBSIDIES.

BY LOUIS WINDMÜLLER.

PREVIOUS to the Civil War, we occupied for some time a prominent place amongst maritime nations; American vessels carried more than one-third of the world's commerce. Our boys loved the sea as ducklings love their pond, and were proud of their predilection; to become a master of a ship was their great ambition. We knew then how to build and to sail the most graceful and the swiftest clippers encountered on the high seas. Alas, they have well nigh disappeared from the ocean! Gradually they have been superseded by steamers, which do not depend as much on wind and weather. Their speed, if not greater, is more uniform and the term of their voyage can better be depended upon. Unfortunately, we were not as well prepared for their construction as England was, especially when iron came to be used instead of oak. About fifteen years ago, American bunting was rarely seen outside our own country. Now there are indications that we are gradually coming to the front again. The following table shows the efficiency of the merchant marines of the seafaring nations in 1890-91, as compared with 1898-99:

COMPARATIVE EFFICIENCY OF MERCHANT MARINES OF THE PRINCIPAL MARITIME NATIONS, STATED IN THOUSANDS OF REGISTERED TONS.*

	1890-91.	1898-99.	Increase in per cent. in 1898-99 against 1890-91.	Per cent. of world's tonnage in 1898-99.
England	18,883	23,059	+22.1	53.3
United States	2,410	3,884	+61.2	9
Germany	2,554	3,536	+38.4	8.2
Norway	1,772	2,189	+23.5	5.1
France	1,731	1,668	— 3.6	3.9
Italy	996	1,230	+23.4	2.8
Spain	930	1,135	+22	2.6
Russia	589	865	+46.9	2
Sweden	675	848	+25.6	2
Japan	297	867	+192.3	2
Holland	603	814	+35	1.9
Denmark	418	678	+62.2	1.6
Austria	379	614	+62	1.4
Belgium	220	291	+32.3	0.7
World's marine	34,060	43,269	+27.4	100

*Some 160,000 tons belonging to minor States, and representing 3.5 per cent. of the world's tonnage, are omitted.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We still are far behind England, which controls almost six times as much of the world's tonnage as we do. But it will be seen that, without considering the unique growth of Japan, we have, with Denmark and Austria, made considerable progress; we have, like them, during these nine years, increased our tonnage more than sixty per cent. We even are forging ahead of Germany, who threw down the gauntlet to all maritime nations when she boasted that the ocean is to be her empire: "*Unsere Zukunft liegt auf dem Meere.*"

Steel has in turn superseded iron, and materials for building steel ships are cheaper here than they are anywhere else. Machinery is not yet as low as it is on the Clyde, simply because we have not had the opportunity to make as much of it. That it must become cheaper is evident from the fact that great quantities of similar machines, for which there is a larger demand, are already exported by us. Labor remains dearer here, and it is claimed by some that it still costs fifteen per cent. more to build a fast ocean carrier in America than it does in Great Britain. The claim of others that our shipbuilders, if so inclined, could already compete successfully with European builders, is sustained by the fact that one of our leading yards came near securing an order recently for an ocean liner from abroad, its bid being less than ten per cent. above that of a German competitor. Old builders have more orders than, for some years to come, they will be able to fill. Until additional shipyards furnish more vessels capable of satisfying a larger proportion of the enormous demand of our export trade, the cost of American steamers will not be lowered. The following figures demonstrate the expansion of this export trade, which has resulted in an average increase of rates of fifty per cent. for outward freight. Of the exports of domestic merchandise for the first nine months of the years 1898, 1899 and 1900, respectively, $29,595,262, $48,599,280 and $50,408,689 were carried in American steamers, and $707,451,899, $713,123,868, $819,736,677 in foreign steamers.

All measures which will foster the important industry of building ships deserve serious consideration. The title of the bill (H. R. 64) which is now before Congress claims that "it will promote the commerce and increase the foreign trade of the United States," and that "it will provide for the national defense." For years to come it proposes to subsidize owners of cer-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tain ships to the extent of $9,000,000 each year. In detail it provides that, for twenty years, a subsidy shall be paid to owners of United States vessels, sail or steam, engaged in foreign trade, on each voyage (there being not above sixteen entries in twelve months) to or from foreign ports over 150 miles distant from a United States port, per gross ton of capacity, at the rate of one and one-half cents for each 100 miles up to 1,500 miles, and one cent for each 100 miles of remaining distance. And it provides, *in addition,* for *steamers* of 1,500 or more tons capacity, per gross ton of capacity for each 100 miles of the whole voyage, for the payment of subsidy as follows:

(1.) On vessels over 1,500 tons, of 14 to 15 knots, 1 cent; of 15 to 16 knots, 1 1-10 cents; of 16 or more knots, 1 2-10 cents.

(2.) On vessels over 3,000 tons, of 17 to 18 knots, 1 4-10 cents; of 18 to 19 knots, 1 6-10 cents; of 19 or more knots, 1 8-10 cents.

(3.) On vessels over 8,000 tons, of 20 to 21 knots, 2 cents; of 21 or more knots, 2 3-10 cents; making the subsidy range from 1 cent to 3.8 cents per ton per 100 miles.

And it further provides for the payment of subsidy at one-half of the foregoing rates to the following foreign built vessels: (*a*) Those now in the United States foreign trade and partially owned by American citizens, who shall promptly acquire full ownership; and (*b*) Those that may be contracted for under such ownership.

Under these conditions, the proposed law requires, as to foreign built ships, that, within ten years, an amount of new shipping equal to the subsidized shipping shall be built in the United States, the subsidy to be meanwhile retained, and, as to United States built ships, that, within ten years, one-fourth of the amount of the subsidized shipping shall be built in the United States, the subsidy to be meanwhile paid.

As to all United States built ships, it is provided that one-fourth of the crew shall be American citizens, except in cases where the United States consul or port officer judges that such proportion cannot "reasonably be obtained," and, as to subsidized vessels, that, if the Secretary of the Navy or of the Treasury require, each vessel shall carry "one American boy" for each thousand tons, as apprentice, a reasonable sum to be paid for his services; that subsidized vessels shall carry United States mails

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

free of charge; and that they may be taken by the United States "as cruisers or transports," the United States paying the "fair value" of the same.

I heartily approve of the avowed objects of this bill; but I claim that, in its present shape, it will fail to accomplish them. The subsidies for which it provides would chiefly accrue, for some time to come, to American lines which cross the Atlantic and Pacific for the purpose of carrying passengers and expensive freight. What the country really needs is carriage at reasonable rates for the immense yield of our agriculture, and for the bulky products of our mines; if that were readily obtainable, exports could further be increased.* Take, for instance, our coal, which is being exported to supply demands from almost every quarter of the globe.

The annual exports of coal and coke from Great Britain aggregate nearly fifty million tons. Our exports, probably, will reach eight million tons for 1900, against five million for 1899. We exported in the first nine months of 1900, to Europe alone, some 500,000 tons of coal, against 19,316 tons during the same period in 1899. In 1900, the cost of our coal was about $2.50, and the freight to the Mediterranean ports, where we have begun to compete with England, amounts to $5—in some cases to $5.75—per ton. These freights have been especially high, because the demand for steamers to carry coal has been greater than the supply. If a sufficient number of vessels could be found gradually to reduce the freight to normal rates, not only could we, in all probability, satisfy the urgent demand which prevails now, but the export of coal, which we can mine for less money than English operators, might permanently be extended to countries which heretofore have been supplied by England, and which England now finds it difficult to supply, since the demand for English coal by English manufacturers has increased. The price for English coal has gradually advanced in consequence.

If a bounty of twenty-five cents per ton were to be paid by the government on American coal exported in American bottoms to foreign countries where it does not conflict with commercial treaties (except to Canada and Mexico), it would stimulate the exportation of this article, foster the building of colliers suitable

*Absence of direct steam communication with portions of our southern continent is another serious disadvantage. Our mail to Buenos Ayres continues to be forwarded via England.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for the trade by our shipyards, and bring about a reduction in rates of freight which might enable us to sell coal in England. It would take some time before such a bounty could involve the country in any considerable outlay. Long before the export could increase to one-half of the present British exports, the trade would become independent of assistance. Similar bounties have often been paid by older countries for similar objects. Whenever, during the eighteenth century, cereals went below cost of production, England assisted her farmers by an export bounty on wheat. The premiums which the northern countries of Continental Europe have, since 1892, paid on exports of sugar, have resulted in a remarkable extension of beet-root cultivation. Although the United States, once their best customers, impose upon their sugar an additional duty equal to that bounty, the production has continued to increase. Now it is proposed to abolish these export bounties, since over-supply has begun to cause stagnation.

If we were to stimulate the production and cheapen the supply of coal, we would confer a greater and more lasting benefit upon our country than Germany has reaped from her ephemeral sugar bounty. The cheaper fuel is, the greater is the industrial power of the nation which produces it. Between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans lie unexplored coal fields, the supplies of which are inexhaustible. If some of these, and other hidden resources of our vast territory, were made available by small bounties, larger advantages would result to a greater number of people, at lesser cost, than can be expected from the mail steamers it is proposed to subsidize.

But bounties are dangerous stimulants, which must be cautiously administered and carefully watched. They should be paid for services only as long as services are rendered, ceasing when their objects have been accomplished.

When subsidies which are not earned are paid for the carriage of mail, they lead to extravagance and defeat the objects for which ostensibly they were granted. Shortly after 1852, when the subsidy to the old Collins Line of steamers was increased from $385,000 to $850,000 annually, the line met with one disaster after another, the service became inefficient, and when the subsidy was withdrawn in 1858 the company failed. The experience of our Pacific Mail Steamship Company, which from

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

1865 to 1876 received an annual subsidy of $500,000, was similar. The line lost in nine years nine steamers; its managers became careless, so that they could find no means to build the additional steamers necessary to obtain a further subsidy of $500,000 which was offered, in 1872, for additional service. Shares in that company, which paid large dividends before 1865, became almost worthless.

It was shown by Congressional inquiry that the money which should have been used for building steamers was wrongfully spent to influence legislation. If the directors had attended to their legitimate business, instead of lobbying in Washington and of speculating in Wall Street, they might have left a better reputation behind them. The few German and English lines which receive subsidies for carrying mails depend for their success, not on these comparatively small contributions, but on economical and prudent management. Their tonnage forms but a small portion, less than five per cent., of the aggregate tonnage which, without assistance, carries on the foreign commerce of these nations. The Hamburg Line furnished an example of self-help when, three years ago, it celebrated the fiftieth anniversary of its existence. Without ever having received a penny for subsidies, it had increased its fleet since 1847 from a few sailing ships to 390,000 tons—thus becoming the largest steamship company in the world. On the other hand, a French line of steamers which received last year more than one million dollars, is not in a flourishing condition. France is almost the only nation which pays large direct subsidies, similar to those contemplated by this bill, to its merchant marine; and France is the only country whose merchant marine has declined in the last ten years, as shown in the foregoing table.

The Subsidy Bill also claims to provide auxiliary cruisers and transports, when necessary to the government. It is true that the need of such vessels became apparent when we began war with Spain, and that a large portion of those which were available proved to be inadequate; the fact is well known that, for alterations of purchased ships, our government paid more than they cost. Such ships are still under charter to transport troops, freight and animals from the Pacific coast to the Philippine Islands. That this service could be better performed by vessels for which this bill seeks subsidies is not made clear; but there

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

can be no doubt that a great many ships entirely suitable for army transports and as naval cruisers could be built for less money than it is proposed to spend on these subsidies. These ships would be the property of the government, not of an entirely independent merchant marine, which, though subsidized, could dictate its own terms of sale or charter. Government vessels could, in cases of emergency similar to one which arose recently in Galveston, always be made available.

More seamen of greater usefulness than the crews of subsidized steamers could be obtained, if we were to create a Naval Reserve similar to the English. The annual expense would be some $250,000, instead of $50,000, which the government now contributes to the support of the existing naval militia. The utility of these hybrid organizations has often been questioned; they are controlled simultaneously by federal and State authorities, which do not always harmonize. During the war with Spain, they furnished some excellent officers, most of whom had been educated at the Naval Academy of Annapolis. But they are not so constituted as to provide, in sufficient numbers, trained, able-bodied seamen, who are essential to the successful navigation of a vessel. To the English Naval Reserve no boys or men are admitted who have not had practical experience in seamanship; to belong to it is a valuable privilege and an honor. Members can always command good positions with fair wages. British ships, which are, to the extent of five per cent., officered and manned by Naval Reserve men, have the privilege of flying a blue ensign instead of the white flag of the regular British Navy. The British Naval Reserve ranks next to the Navy; in case of war it can always be depended upon for assistance.

We might try the experiment of allowing our merchants to buy ships where they can get them on the most favorable terms, and offer them American registers on condition that they engage in transportation of our foreign commerce, when conducted by officers trained in a United States Naval Reserve. There would be no lack of applications for such service, because it would sooner lead to adequate pay and promotion than enlistment in the regular Navy. The privilege of sailing foreign built ships commanded by American officers under our flag, would lead toward a modification of our antiquated, whilom British, navigation laws. These statutes, by which British shipping had been protected since

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Cromwell's time, were practically abandoned by England in 1849, while we were her formidable rival. British merchants were then permitted to buy our ships and sail them under their own flag, when engaged in their foreign commerce. All other maritime nations have followed this example except the United States, and the merchant marine of all other nations has increased, while our own has during that time diminished. One of the consequences has been that American merchants, who have found it to be for their interest to buy English steamers, actually sail them under the British flag—thus adding to the power and prestige of that country instead of their own. Germany, since Bismarck's time the most ardent advocate of protection, has no reason to regret that she upholds free trade in ships. The steam tonnage of her merchant marine has increased one thousand per cent. in twenty-nine years, and Stettin has begun to rival Glasgow in furnishing ships for the world's trade. Amongst leading protectionists, James G. Blaine declared in favor of this policy, because it would lead to an expansion of our trade.

The extraordinary development of our interstate commerce and home industries has absorbed our attention to such a degree that we have allowed the carrying trade on the ocean to slip away from us. We ought to make every effort to regain the prestige we enjoyed fifty years ago, when we practically shared with England the dominion of the sea, which for centuries past the British had exclusively controlled. Our ocean craft should be as free of taxation as United States bonds are. Port and dock charges—which in New York are exorbitant—must be reduced to a minimum. Friends and members of the Chamber of Commerce of New York now undertake the difficult task of clearing that city of vice. If they were to ascertain who profit by the extravagant terminal charges which drive the ocean trade away, and if they were to induce the assessors to tax these mischievous profits until charges were reduced to reasonable proportions, they would accomplish an object more worthy of their endeavor, with less trouble.* Seafaring men should be protected against impo-

*The expenses of transferring goods from the termini of railroads to the ships are technically called "terminal charges." Indignation has often been expressed in the New York Chamber of Commerce and Produce Exchange at the atrocity of these charges at that port without leading to any abatement. It appears to me that the city would be justified in reclaiming by taxes some of these profits, as the city loses in consequence of them, by diversion of the ocean carrying trade.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sitions by public authority and private charity.* To the longest seacoast in the Temperate, we have added some of the richest islands in the Torrid Zone. We own commodious harbors which offer safe outlets to a larger quantity of commodities than is yielded by any other country in the world. Let us devise means to send them across the sea in American ships. Covering two-thirds of the terrestrial globe, oceans form common highways for international commerce, on which the strength of each nation is apt to be gauged by the tonnage which her flag protects.

*Seamen while ashore are better protected by law and Boards of Trade in Great Britain than they are in this country. The Seaman's Branch of the Legal Aid Society of New York, to which the writer belongs, gratuitously assisted last October 435 seamen, and recovered $1,380.74, which had been wrongfully withheld or extorted from them.

LOUIS WINDMÜLLER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SOME INTERPRETERS OF WAGNER.

BY AMHERST WEBBER.

It is related that a would-be amateur of Wagner was advised, for his first hearing of "Tristan," to take a seat from which the stage could not be seen, and to follow the action in the book of words in order to prepare his understanding. He arrived late; and, judging from the terrific noise in the orchestra that there was, at least, a charge of cavalry on the stage, he asked his neighbor to find the place for him in the text-book. There he read the stage direction: *"Isolde stufzt"* (Isolde sighs.) The moral of this story is that in the modern orchestra lies the true stumbling-block of the singer of Wagner's opera. Those who have taken part in theatricals know how enormously the difficulty of expressing a shade of sentiment by inflection of voice is increased when the voice has to be raised above its natural pitch; it sweeps away all spontaneity, and compels the actor to find an artificial equivalent for the inflections that had occurred to him as he read through his part. Infinitely greater is the difficulty when a singer is required to suggest subtle shades of sentiment across the raging tempest of a Wagnerian orchestra. Every singer not gifted with a voice of phenomenal volume has to invent for himself a trick of voice production which will penetrate the orchestra without tiring him, and it is seldom that this is attained without the sacrifice of expression and color of voice. Hence, the well-worn cries, "How nice it would be without the shouting!" etc.

Things are vastly changed since the days of Italian opera of the old school. The Italian singer before Mario's time was an inferior stamp of person, without much education or intelligence. All that was expected of him was that he should have a sympathetic voice, know how to produce it, and how to phrase a cantilena; if, in addition, he had any personal charm, he became the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

idol of the public. He had not a high respect for his faithful adorers in the Covent Garden stalls, for anecdotes are still fresh among Italians of the awful things they used to interpolate in the Italian text, to amuse one another at the expense of their innocent audience. Mario took the world by storm, not because his voice was in any way phenomenal, but because he was a gentleman (the first of the species in that profession), and knew how to wear costumes, and to make all the rôles he played seem possible. He had a very sympathetic *mezza-voce,* which he used throughout the length of an opera—as well he might, considering the lightness of the orchestra that accompanied him. Besides removing all danger of fatigue, this gave him a facility of expression impossible under the present condition of opera. For, to sing Wagner, one must have a voice of great volume and resistance, one must be a good musician, one must have intelligence, dramatic instinct, temperament and magnetism, in addition to being a good singer from the Italian standpoint. The man who possesses all these, it is true, is too near the ideal to be easily come at; but in these days the public refuses to listen to a singer who falls far short in any one of them.

Bayreuth is the last place to go to for the ideal artist; and yet, though the Bayreuth performances are far from perfect, those given elsewhere are always something of a compromise in comparison. For, in the Bayreuth theatre, the singer's chief difficulty was solved by Wagner himself. By sinking the orchestra in a pit, he made it possible for a singer to whisper if he wants to (and that is not too often), and yet be heard above the orchestra. The effect of this device is astounding; the orchestration of "Tristan," which elsewhere may seem an unwieldy mass of sound that forces the singer to shout or stand impotently agape, is at Bayreuth a fine lace-work accompaniment, full of wonderful detail, and capable of the minutest shades. It seems to be the most difficult of a conductor's many difficult duties to obtain a real *piano* from a full Wagnerian orchestra; for it is not until every member of the band has got his part thoroughly into his head, and on his fingers or lips, as the case may be, that anything approaching a *piano* is to be hoped for. In "Tristan," which is very fully scored, there are passages in which it is well nigh impossible not to cover the voice. How seldom, outside Bayreuth, does Isolde succeed in making herself heard all through the Liebestod! It was

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

only at the hands of Seidl, who had a wonderful knack of getting great accents out of his orchestra, and subduing it again immediately so as not to overpower her, that the singer could emerge from the ocean of sound that must otherwise have drowned her altogether. Seidl's sudden death was a terrible blow to all the artists who had worked with him, as well as to the great New York public. I know of no one who was so helpful in rehearsals. He was conductor, stage-manager and carpenter rolled into one. He would show the dragon how to fight, Siegfried how to forge his sword, the Rhine-daughters how to dive. A Wagner conductor is bound to have some skill in stage-management, since the music is so intimately connected with every detail on the stage. Seidl's training in this branch of his art had been exceptional; for, while still a boy, he had stood at Wagner's right hand, and was actually living at Wahnfried while the Nibelungen Ring was being composed. He delighted to talk of those days, and of the Meister, for whom he seems to have had a genuine affection, as well as an unbounded admiration. He told how Wagner used to get up at four or five in the morning and work steadily until late in the afternoon, with an interval for luncheon, nobody being allowed to go near him; how he was almost ludicrously susceptible to his surroundings, and must have his study draped with different colors, according to the work he was engaged upon, in order to bring himself into the right frame of mind. For instance, for "Tristan," the hangings were yellow and black; for the "Walküre," blue; for "Siegfried," of course, green; and for the "Götterdämmerung," a gloomy brown. When he set to work in the morning, he might have been heard hammering away at a single chord on the piano for a long time, to recreate the frame of mind in which he had left off the day before. What seems incredible is that he made but one rough sketch, and then wrote out the whole portentous score, with all the minute instructions, in that wonderfully neat hand of his, almost without a correction. Seidl remembered him coming in to luncheon in despair, because he had not sufficient instruments in his orchestra to do all that he wanted; this was when he was working at the finale of the "Götterdämmerung." One evening, when the whole family was assembled, he left the room and returned carrying a roll of manuscript under his arm; and, mimicking the manner of a professional pianist, he announced that he was going to play them a piece on the piano. At the best, he

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was a very poor pianist, and it was impossible to make head or tail of what he was playing; but, nevertheless, when he had finished, eyes were moist. He had given them the first performance of the Funeral March in "Götterdämmerung."

When "Tristan" was first rehearsed at Munich, its performance was pronounced to be humanly impossible; and Wagner had already resigned himself to the idea of making changes in the score that would bring it within the range of mortal singers, when he was told that it could, after all, be given as it stood. It would certainly have been interesting to have the simplified edition. The great secret in learning one of the long Wagnerian rôles is to take plenty of time over it: a part learned quickly—by forced marches, as it were—is sure to be badly learnt; and, unless the words and music have impregnated the artist's blood long before rehearsals begin, many unsuspected faults will mar the performance. Hence foreign singers are generally more correct in words and music than Germans, because they have had to spend more time in learning their parts in the first instance. Jean de Reszke worked for three years at "Tristan," and for over two at "Siegfried," although no artist approaches him in facility. He studies most of his new parts at Skrzydlow (pronounced Skshidloof), his home in Poland, where he spends three months or so every year; and his work is none the worse for being diversified with shooting, riding, racing, lawn-tennis, and all that goes to make country life pleasant. Before he begins a new rôle, Madame de Reszke, who is an excellent linguist, writes out the German text and stage directions in a note-book, with a literal French translation of each word underneath. The learning is divided into three stages: the first, the words and music; the second, the words alone (Mme. de Reszke's note-book); and the third, the whole work from memory. M. Jean de Reszke read through the whole of the first act of "Siegfried" at the first sitting, and he knew both "Tristan" and "Siegfred" thoroughly fully twelve months before he sang them in public. He leaves as little as possible to the regular rehearsals on the stage; because, when the opera season has once opened, and he is singing twice or even three times a week, he cannot, consistently with his rule of avoiding rehearsals on the day before a performance, have as many rehearsals as he would like. The first time he was to sing Tristan to Madame Lilli Lehmann's Isolde in New York, he had been suffering from a bad cold, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

had been told by the doctor that his only chance of being able to sing lay in keeping his room till the night of the performance. On the day before the performance, Lilli Lehmann went to see him at his hotel. Refusing all assistance, she proceeded to push the sofas and chairs about until they represented to her satisfaction her state-room in King Mark's yacht. While she was thus employed, Marie Brema, who was to sing Brangaene, appeared on the scene. She had that moment arrived from London, and, hearing at the landing stage that there was to be a *Verstandigungs-Probe* in Jean de Reszke's room, she had, like a real Bayreuthian, left her luggage to its fate rather than miss anything in the nature of a rehearsal. Scarcely had she been announced when Van Rooy, the Kurwenal, who had also scented a rehearsal, burst into the room; King Mark was already on the spot in the person of M. Edouard de Reszke, and there followed an impromptu rehearsal which must have surprised the visitors in the neighboring rooms. For Lilli Lehmann, Marie Brema and Van Rooy, ignoring the smallness of the room, sang with all their lungs, and were as punctilious about their smallest gesture as if the eyes of the United States were upon them; while Jean de Reszke and his brother, who was singing that evening, just indicated their parts with the utmost economy of voice, from time to time vainly imploring the rest of the cast to save a little voice for the performance. At last, Isolde, to the huge delight of the audience that had collected on the landing outside, having insisted upon singing to the end of the Liebestod, fell dead upon the carpet, and was helped to her feet in a state which may be left to the imagination of those who know the temperature of American hotels. Her performance the next evening showed no sign of diminished energy. On arriving on the stage, she pointed with disgust to a skin lying at the foot of her couch, which certainly did look as if it might harbor malignant microbes, besides being a trap for unwary feet, and ordered it to be removed, and, the stage-manager vainly protesting, replaced it by an imitation Aubusson carpet which had been doing duty in "La Traviata" the night before. Taking her seat upon her couch, Isolde now sent for the conductor, and gave him minute instructions regarding the passages which were to be kept down; and the unfortunate prompter was then haled before her to be soundly rated for want of attention at her last performance. By the time the curtain rose, she had reduced every person in authority to a state of cringing obedi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ence, and everything went just as Isolde wished it to go. It was a magnificent performance; and, at the end, Isolde, according to her custom, threw a hood over her head, and walked from the overheated theatre through the frosty air to catch the tram-car which was to take her to her hotel. With such a constitution, a singer must be strangely content with his calling.

A New York newspaper reporter once put a delicate question to M. Jean de Reszke. "Tell me candidly, do you not think that you are paid absurdly high for what you do?" The answer was this: "On nights when I am in good health, voice, and spirits, it does seem that I am highly paid for doing what I love best to do; but when I am out of health, voice, and spirits, and yet have to make a superhuman effort not to disappoint my manager and the public, no sum in the world is too great to compensate me for what I have to go through."

The controversy about "cuts" is still burning. No human being can sit with undivided attention through any of Wagner's later works uncut, except with intervals of an hour or so between the acts, and that entails giving up the whole day to the performance, and at once puts the opera beyond the range of those for whom it was written. Unquestionably, outside Bayreuth, there must be cuts. Madame Wagner has advocated them on principle, and so did the Meister himself with the view of making his works popular. But herein lies the difficulty: Wagner having left no instructions as to how his work should be curtailed, no two singers or conductors agree on the point. For instance, Seidl recommends a cut as having been made at a performance attended by Wagner, who, when asked afterward if he objected to it, replied that he had not noticed it; yet other conductors condemn that cut as sacrilege, and in their turn suggest omissions that would have made Seidl's hair stand on end. I remember sitting near Madame Wagner at Covent Garden during a performance of "Die Meistersinger" in Italian. She was delighted with certain features of the performance; naturally, she had never heard the Preislied sung as Jean de Reszke sang it, and she was in ecstasies; she kept exclaiming that she caught new beauties of melody that no German singer had ever suggested, and she thought that Germans might find much to learn even in diction from this cosmopolitan cast. But she winced visibly, as if in bodily pain, whenever we came to a cut, and said that, with so much chopping, there could be no "*stimmung*" in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the performance. "It should be called 'Scenes from the 'Meistersinger,'" she said at last; "as such, it is an admirable performance!" Yet these "Scenes from the 'Meistersinger'" had lasted from eight o'clock in the evening till after midnight.

The ideal way of hearing a work of these dimensions would be to take no more than one act on each of three consecutive days. I shall never forget the effect of attending a rehearsal of the third act only of "Tristan" one morning. Those who have only heard it performed after the other two, and at the end of a day's work, cannot realize the stupendous effect that it has upon one who hears it with all the faculties rested.

Madame Wagner's appreciation of the Covent Garden rendering of *"I Maestri Cantori"* goes to prove that *bel canto* is as essential in Wagner's music as in any other; but, whereas in Italian Opera it was the end, in Wagner's it is only one of many means to an end. Wagner tried to find expression for the whole range of human emotions, and naturally he availed himself of all the means at his disposal. He pressed into his service the sister arts of poetry, music and mime, using them now singly, now in combination, with an unerring judgment as to which the dramatic exigencies required. At one time he finds his dramatic expression in words alone, and there the music takes a subordinate place, and everything should be sacrificed to a correct and clear declamation of the text, as in the dialogue between Tristan and Brangaene in the first act. At another, when he would express *Stimmungen* for which words alone would be inadequate, words in their turn become subsidiary to music, the essential medium. Again, there are situations where music suffices unassisted, as in the opening scene of the third act of "Tristan," or assisted only by gesture, as in the silent scene between Siegmund, Sieglinde and Hunding in the first act of the "Walküre." As a general rule, the German interpreter falls into the mistake of declaiming his whole rôle, as if it all fell into the first category, because he understands declaiming better than singing, and because he loves to spit his consonants in the face of his audience, and to do anything that will excuse him from singing a single phrase purely and smoothly; while the typical opera-singer—the Italian variety seems to be almost extinct—will fall into the opposite error, and fight shy of all strongly accented declamation which may interfere with the pose of his voice, trying to prune all into the shape of the pure, smooth singing that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

he has spent his life in acquiring. Small wonder that Madame Wagner, while missing certain strong accents, found new melodies in *"I Maestri Cantori"* at Covent Garden, and that Jean de Reszke took all Wagner-lovers by storm when they first heard him in "Tristan." They had become resigned to looking upon that marvelous third act of "Tristan" as an almost purely orchestral work, in which the singer's part was limited to a mere dramatic declamation of the text without much variety of tone-color or exaggerated accuracy of intonation. It gave the listener the impression that it was extremely difficult for the singer. Before Jean de Reszke sang it, he had become sufficiently familiar with the methods of German singers to know the secret of their love of declamation, and he knew exactly when to sing and when to declaim, with the result that one seemed to find heart-rending melodies that one had never heard before, and that intervals which had till then appeared merely exceedingly difficult were transformed into the most melodious, natural, and even inevitable means of expression.

The work that a débutant has to undergo at Bayreuth before the performances is very severe. He has to arrive at the town many weeks before the first performance, knowing his part thoroughly. He then goes through a course of training with Herr Kniese, Madame Wagner's *alter ego,* who, besides possessing unerring taste in diction, is very clever at teaching correct declamation and in curing singers of bad habits contracted in study elsewhere. His duties at Bayreuth are arduous and varied. I once caught him between the acts of "Götterdämmerung" engaged in unharnessing a droschka horse. Grane had suddenly been taken ill, and this animal was on its way to its first rehearsal as his understudy. The next course of study is a truly alarming ordeal, for it consists in long mornings with Madame Wagner herself at Wahnfried. The pupil is first required to relate, in his own words, the story and meaning of the work of which he is to be the interpreter—no school-boy's task; and then to give a full-blown performance of it on the hearthrug, Madame Wagner herself filling all the other parts that are necessary. And, since the mistress is inexhaustible, the pupil must sing with full voice, and be proof against any fatigue, vocal or physical. Madame Wagner has been overheard to remonstrate with a Brunhild, who throughout a tropical morning had been working with her whole mind and body and voice, and to declare that without "energy" nothing could be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

accomplished, although, Heaven knows, want of energy is the last reproach that can be levelled against this particular Brunhild. Yet, with very few exceptions, all who have undergone this course of training, however they may have differed from Madame Wagner on certain points, admit that they have profited by it incalculably. There are, besides, countless long rehearsals on the stage, first without, and afterward with, the orchestra. It is through these that the Bayreuth performances acquire a spirit that cannot be attained elsewhere; but one wonders why they are not even more perfect than they are, for although the *ensemble* is generally excellent, the performance of the individual artist is often on quite a different level. But this is the fault of the material rather than the workmanship. Madame Wagner has to choose between raw recruits with good voices, who are only too anxious to put themselves under her guidance in everything, but who have not been through the mill of vocal study, and artists already formed, who have thought out their parts and object to be under the artistic dictatorship of any one. Moreover, singers who have made their name, and have to go through long seasons in London and New York, cannot be expected to sacrifice the only months in which they can recuperate at health-giving waters or mountain air to hard labor in Bayreuth during July and August.

There seems to be an extraordinary wealth of magnificent voices among German women, who fall into fewer errors in voice-production than the men; but how rarely we meet a German *prima donna* who has any feminine grace or personal magnetism! Generally, excessive energy of voice and gesture are made to serve for real temperament, and an unconvincing substitute they make. Temperament is not the same as violence: it cannot fail to reveal itself as strongly in a simple phrase, simply spoken, as in the most overpowering loosing of the flood-gates of passion, and an audience may be moved more by what a real artist keeps back than by what he gives out. He who allows himself to be run away with on the stage by what is called temperament, carries no more conviction to his audience than a man in a rage does to a crowd in the street. He merely gives an impression of unseemly impotence, and loses altogether that concentration of expression which is what really moves his hearers. In recalling the rôles that have most appealed to us in the work of any great dramatic artist, how seldom it is the violent outbursts of emotion that leave a lasting impression!

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Is it not oftener a look, or a subtle inflection of the voice, which is achieved not by temperament alone, but by temperament restrained by art? It is only art and hard study that can give to temperament the equilibrium and beauty that it requires for its perfect expression. A celebrated Wagnerian *prima donna*, speaking of a colleague, said that what she admired most in him was the wonderful way in which he abandoned himself, even though, his voice not being very strong, he was worn out before the end of the evening. It showed a spirit of heroic self-sacrifice; but, in the language of the gallery, one would like to ask, "Where do the audience and the music come in?" There is something admirable and pathetic in the German genius for self-sacrifice to their art. Friedrichs, the greatest of Beckmessers, worked so hard that he was laid up with brain-fever after his first season at Bayreuth. He took the part of Alberich there two years ago, and declaimed the whole of the scene in which he appears to Hagen in a vision (in the second act of "Götterdämmerung") in a mysterious hoarse whisper which was exceedingly telling, but which one felt must be tearing his poor vocal chords to shreds. When I met him some months afterward at St. Petersburg, he told me that he was only just out of the hands of the doctors, who had warned him never to abuse his voice again in that fashion. Schnorr, the tenor, who created Tristan, died very soon after its production.

The ideal Wagner singer must have self-restraint, but first among his qualifications must be a constitution of iron and nerves of steel.

AMHERST WEBBER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ZOROASTRIANISM AND THE PARSIS.

BY D. MENANT.

AMONG the numerous divisions and subdivisions of Indian castes, there is a foreign ethnical group, which, in spite of its alien environments and utter isolation, has been able for centuries to preserve the purity of its race and faith and most of its traditional customs. We mean the adepts of the prophet of Iran, Zoroaster, successively called by the European travellers who have met them on the Indian coast, "Parseos," "Parses," "Parsees," "Parsis"; they are the descendants of the fugitives who fled from Persia after the Mohammedan Conquest, and settled at Sanjan in the eighth century of the Christian era. What was their exact number? Probably a very small one. Was this exodus from Persia the only one? It appears that several others took place, traces of which can be found in Upper India; but the colony of Guzarat alone resisted the influence of their surroundings, and did not merge into the native populations. Nevertheless, they were—they are still—a mere drop in the vast ocean of Indian communities, and at first they would seem to be a negligible quantity, except for the scholars who see in them the last representatives of one of the oldest creeds of the world and the depositaries of the sacred books of the Avesta and Persian lore. They are, in fact, the most active agents of progress and reform in British India, and have to be considered from a double standpoint, both religious and social. They occupy such a conspicuous position that an excellent critic affirms that "it is scarcely possible to conceive of the public life of Western India without them." This judgment will meet with no contradiction from any quarter. However, we would not have the conclusion drawn from this that the Parsis are the only workers in the vast field of civic usefulness. There are among the other communities deserving men,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bent on promoting the welfare of India; but, beyond any doubt, at the dawn of the twentieth century, the Parsis are enjoying a well deserved reputation for enlightened patriotism.

"By their natural ability and position in the country, they were well fitted thus to be the mediators between the rulers and the ruled, and they are now playing this part to a considerable extent. In political and literary matters, the Parsis have led the Hindus and the Mohammedans. At the head of most political associations, at any rate in Bombay, and in the vanguard of those who fight, rightly or wrongly, for the political advancement of educated Indians, are to be found men of this race. It is a Parsi for whom has been reserved the unique position of being the first Oriental to take a seat in the British House of Commons. . . . . In social matters, they easily take the lead of their Hindu countrymen, as they are singularly free from those narrow views of caste which hamper the latter. . . . . It is a Parsi who has taken up the cause of Social Reform among the Hindu population, and tried to better the lot of millions of women, mute victims of unequal laws and customs manufactured during the dark ages of Indian history."*

Through their association with Europeans, the Parsis have undergone a complete change and have taken their place in our modern society. It has even been suggested that they are so thoroughly Anglicized that they are lacking in interest. Quite the reverse is the case. It is their very readiness to accept the improvements of life and to assimilate our methods, their unprejudiced and broad-minded intellect, combined with a passionate attachment to their ancestral creed, which make them so sympathetic. We hope that in this short sketch we shall be able to show that Western civilization will not destroy Zoroastrianism, and that the future of the small Parsi community is not to be looked to either with concern or apprehension on the sole pretense that they are gradually discarding purely Hindu customs. What has garb to do with inner life and faith? A Parsi can tread the whole earth, wear any sort of dress, embrace any career, provided he keep pure in his heart the tenets of his religion, and make them sensible to his fellow men by putting into practice his immortal precepts of *good thoughts, good words, good deeds.* Such is our own opinion, and it is likely to be shared by any one who will study the transformation of the social status of the Parsis.

I.

In 716 A. D., after a succession of hardships, a small troop of Persians, warriors and priests, fled from their own native land

*"Karkaria, Forty Years of Progress and Reform," p. 50.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and disembarked at Sanjan, which is situated twenty-five miles south of Damaun (Guzarat), in quest of a permanent abode where they could freely practice their religious rites. At that time, Sanjan was a flourishing emporium, and a favorable welcome was given to the exiles. The Hindu prince, the wise Tadi Rana, greeted the *Dasturs* (or Priests), and asked them several questions about their creeds and habits. The answers of the learned priests were so satisfactory that a sort of compact was passed between the immigrants and the Rana, who gave them permission to settle in his territory, and granted them the privilege of building a temple of the Sacred Fire. In their turn, the Persians submitted to certain obligations, as, for example, to wear no arms, to dress according to the Hindu fashion, to adopt some of the local customs; and they so strictly adhered to the clauses that, up to the present time, some of them are still observed. It is most important to note the starting point of the friendly intercourse of the Parsis with the native populations.

For years and years, the Parsis lived in perfect peace and harmony; they increased in number and dispersed in small knots over the whole of Guzarat. The Mohammedan Conquest at first did them harm. They had sided with the Rana against the Sultan of Ahmedabad; after the storming of Sanjan, they had much to suffer from their new rulers, and the Sacred Fire was removed from place to place. However, by degrees, the Parsis grew accustomed to the Mohammedans and had no persecution to suffer.

It seems that, during that time, the community was wholly engaged in agricultural pursuits and absorbed in the practice of their religion. The European travellers, Friar Jordanus, to begin with, mention them in their narratives and relate some of their customs—for instance, fire worship and funeral rites. At the close of the fifteenth century, occurred a most solemn hour in the history of the refugees, viz.: the renewal of the intercourse with the persecuted Zoroastrians, or *Ghebers,* who had persisted in dwelling in Persia. A wealthy and influential Parsi, a resident of Nausari, named Changa Asa, at his own expense, deputed a talented *beh-din* (layman), Nariman Floshang, to Yezd and Kirman, in order to obtain answers to a certain number of questions relating to religion. The Ghebers were overjoyed to see their co-religionist; they did not know that any of their brethren had settled in India. From that time, the relations between the Indian and Persian communities were never interrupted.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Under the Mogul rule, the Parsis continued to prosper. After having been tillers, toddy-drawers, carpenters, cabinet-makers, they became wealthy land owners, ship builders and, in general, extensive traders. Their principal headquarters were Nausari, the priestly town; Surat, the great market of the East; Bombay, the dowry of the Portuguese bride of Charles II. Caste system had proved extremely beneficial in preserving their religious independence, but had left them totally unprejudiced, and had put no barrier between them and the foreigners. Hence, the great advantage to them in mixing freely with the Europeans who were beginning to traffic with India; so that, far from keeping aloof from the Portuguese, the Dutch, the English, they made their services acceptable and acted as middlemen between the newcomers and the natives. By degrees they supplanted the supple *Banyan*;* they became brokers of the factories, *Dubashes, Shroffs.*† Their influence prevailed, and their pent-up energies at last found a vast field for developing themselves. Thanks to unexpected opportunities, an enterprising spirit, and no objection to sea voyages, they opened an extensive trade with the Far East, especially with China, Burma and the Straits. In the meantime, they were doing good and loyal service to the United East India Company. Such is the origin of their attachment to British rule, and of the particular regard and esteem of the British Government for them.

Europe also had early attracted them. In the seventeenth century, a Parsi had already come over to England, and in the following century Maniar was Burke's guest at Beaconsfield.

Wealth rewarded the commercial skill and extreme honesty of the Parsi traders; it made them powerful and influential. Their liberality was universally known; such men as Sorabji Mancherji Readymoney, Ardeshir Dady fed thousands of people during the famines. Towers of Silence, Fire Temples, *Dharmsálas,** charitable institutions, hospitals, colleges were in turn erected by the munificent gifts of their merchant princes. Above all, they were remarkable for their spirit of catholicity, which recognized no difference of race, caste and religion. Ovington, as early as 1689, had noticed this tendency. In 1842, Jamshedji Jijibhai, the Bombay merchant so well known in the whole of India for his

*Banyan, a Hindu trader, and especially of the province of Guzarat. (See P. della Valle, I. 486-7, and Lord. Preface.)
†Shroff, a money-lender, a banker. (Ar. sarráf, also sairaf.)
*Dharmsála (pious edifice), a resting house for wayfarers.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

charities, was honored with Knighthood, and in 1857 was created Baronet, the first native to whom this coveted distinction was granted.

Such was the situation of the community in the early fifties of the nineteenth century. At that time (1852), Briggs could write with accuracy that "the bent of the Parsi community was purely commercial." He was perfectly right, and the evolution, which has turned an exclusively mercantile caste into the one priding itself most on its education and its intellectual pursuits, was only beginning to develop. It is nearly achieved, at least in the main lines. Nowadays, the Parsi is no more the broker or *dubash* of the European; he sits next to him on the benches of the Corporations, in the High Courts, at the Legislative and Vice-Regal Council—nay, even in Parliament. No wonder that such a contact has modified his customs and habits. What has become of the Banyan's co-worker, once in dress and occupation so much like his rival that sometimes the European travellers have confused the two? The Parsi has abandoned his white garments, his curved shoes; in India his brown *pagri* alone distinguishes him. On the Continent, he is an English gentleman.

This transformation that we are now witnessing is entirely due to Western education, and its influence on a race whose plasticity is undeniable, and whose powers of assimilation are of the rarest order. This will be seen presently.

II.

The Parsis were the first natives to take advantage of Western education in the Bombay Presidency; as soon as the Mission Schools set to work and the Elphinstone Institution afforded a chance for intelligent youths, the Parsis flocked to them, in order to benefit by the modern training and equip themselves for a new mode of life. This eagerness to learn had already incited their best men of the former generation to attend the schools of the Eurasians and retired soldiers for the purpose of mastering English. However, it was only in 1849 that the enlightenment of the bulk of the community was seriously undertaken by Sir Jamshedji Jijibhai, who established the Parsi Benevolent Institution for indigent Parsis. The schools soon imparted the blessings of education, free of charge, to thousands of pupils in Bombay and the Mofussil. Sir Jamshedji's example was followed by wealthy co-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

religionists, and instruction rapidly spread among the lower classes.

Nearly at the same time, a spirit of reform had inflamed some generous, enterprising men, Furdunji Naorozji, Behramji Ghaudi, Manakji Kharshedji, Dadabhai Naorozji, who were later on joined by S. S. Bengali, K. N. Kabraji, and others. The reformers were bent on erasing from their family life and inner organization the old Hindu varnish, and they set diligently to work. Their task was not an easy one. In 1861, Mr. Dadabhai Naorozji, in a lecture delivered at the Liverpool Philo-Asiatic Society, explained the peculiar condition of his own community. He said:

"Under ordinary circumstances it may not be difficult to give a general account of the existing manners and customs of a people; but, in the case of the Parsis, in the present transitional state of their social and intellectual condition, it is difficult to say what the whole community observe and believe."

He then established a distinction between the old class and the young one, the orthodox and the reformers, and gave a rapid description of the habits of both, one steeped in an obstinate Hindu conservatism, the other full of Western aspirations. The priestly influence had been appealed to by the two parties. And any one who desires to follow the phases of the struggle can peruse the old Guzarati reports of the Associations started in order to support or refute each other's views. Female education formed, also, a serious part of the programme of the reformers. Parsi ladies were allowed to move about freely, to emancipate themselves from the secluded life which the Hindu fashion had compelled them to adopt. The Parsi's house was gradually becoming a happy home, instead of a gloomy Zenana; the Parsi's wife was made his companion, his children his friends! "Just as the influence of English education had operated on their mental condition, the example of the English modes of life and domestic habits had worked a revolution in their social condition."

Journalism and politics first attracted the most educated; the community soon produced a group of able and qualified professors, barristers, architects, publicists, doctors and scientists. The admission of natives to the different branches of the public service also increased their eagerness to win degrees and diplomas. "The schoolmaster is abroad," Dadabhai had said in his Liverpool lecture; and this far-away schoolmaster, whose influence was so

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

keenly felt, was in fact the most important personage at that stage of the Parsis' social evolution.

The ladies were not long in soliciting complete equality with their lords. Vernacular, Anglo-vernacular, and English institutions afforded them the best opportunities. Some of them matriculated; others followed the whole university training, and were among the very first Indian ladies to obtain degrees (B. A.). In medicine, especially, they are at their best; Parsi lady-doctors are numerous and talented. In 1900, Miss P. B—— has become M. A., the only Indian lady who has gained that degree.

Now, in order to acquaint our readers with the men of whom the Parsis have just reason to be proud, we shall introduce to them the two great personalities alluded to in the first pages of this article: Mr. Dadabhai Naorozji and Mr. Behramji Malabari. Both are the best representatives of the aspirations of the forward party in politics and social reform.

Mr. Dadabhai Naorozji sums up in his long life the whole evolution of his own community. Born in 1825 among the priestly class, he was forced to submit to the Hindu custom of infant marriage, which had also made havoc among the Parsis. Under the excellent tuition of an intelligent mother, he was most successful in his college career, and was among the first batch of Elphinstonians, won prizes and medals, and was the first native appointed to the Chair of Mathematics and Natural History at the Elphinstone Institution (1852-54). He soon resigned his professorship, and went to England as a partner in Mr. K. R. Cama's firm, the first established in London through the agency of natives. In 1874, we see him at the Court of the Gaekwar of Baroda, exercising the functions of *Diwan* (Prime Minister); then, in 1885, he was appointed by Lord Reay a member of the Bombay Legislative Council. After having failed in 1856, he succeeded in being elected, in 1892, as a Liberal member of the House of Commons by a London constituency (Central Finsbury Division).

That a native can be returned to Parliament will excite the wonder of foreigners. Let them remember that a native is a British subject. Let them also reflect upon the number of difficulties which a candidature of that kind is certain to encounter! At the fall of Mr. Gladstone's ministry, Mr. Dadabhai retired.

Such are the main lines of this useful career. Mr. Dadabhai's activity has been unparalleled, his zeal for the welfare of India

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

indefatigable. In his youth, he was already at work with the Bombay reformers; in England, he endeavored to bring India nearer to the metropolis, to promote among the natives the advantages of a system of education which would enable them to take an active share in the administration of their country. He also presided over the National Congress, and started with Mr. B. Malabari the *Voice of India,* at the instigation of Sir W. Wedderburn. There he pursued the same object which he always kept in view, namely, to connect India with England and to place the two countries in direct relationship with one another, without the intervention of the Anglo-Indians. His chief occupation for years has been the study of financial questions of the highest order. He has striven—he still strives—to denounce the causes of the increasing poverty of India, the very causes of the two last disastrous famines which were pointed out by Mr. B. Malabari in his remarkable memoir of "India in 1897," and recently by Mr. Digby, so well known as the originator and Honorary Secretary of the Indian Famine Relief Fund in 1877.

Next to Mr. Dadabhai, ranks the great reformer, Mr. Behramji M. Malabari. "He is not a noisy politician," says his Hindu biographer, Mr. Dayaram Gidumal, "but he has had no small share in moulding the political history of the last ten years. He has been the right hand of Dadabhai Naorozji, and by his moderation as editor of a leading native paper, and by his influence with the native press, did yeoman's service in times of trouble." Indeed, he has succeeded in making the *Indian Spectator* the people of India's own paper. "Being a man of the people himself," says the *Bombay Review,* "he could understand the great majority of the nation, and was particularly fitted for being a trustworthy interpreter between rulers and ruled." An excellent Guzarati poet, wielding a powerful English pen, he had at an early age acquired a great reputation.

His life is not without a romance. The autobiography of his childhood is *"inoubliable,"* to quote the expression of the French critic Filon, and is worthy of a place beside Rousseau's "Confessions," Dickens' "David Copperfield" and Daudet's *"Petit Chose."* Mr. Malabari was left a penniless orphan at the early age of twelve years. He bravely fought the hard battle of life, teaching the whole day boys older than himself, and during sleepless nights warbling beautiful Guzarati tunes, the whole time sustained in his

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hard struggle by the invisible presence of his departed saint, his beloved mother. "Firdausi sings of Rustam having carried the dead bones of his son Sorab round his neck in a string to remind him of his irreparable loss. I carry my mother about in the spirit. She is always present to me. In every good woman I see my mother. I pity every bad or ill-used woman for my mother's sake."

At thirty, he was a successful man, and wealth and honors were within his reach, when suddenly a change came over him. He began to speculate about the evils that mar the Hindu civilization in the higher classes, infant-marriage and enforced-widowhood, and took an intense interest in the inner movement of social reform, which was silently at work among some thoughtful Hindus. He resolved to join them, to take the lead, if no other would do it, and for ten long years he was engrossed in his task. Lectures, pamphlets, tracts—all over India—voyages to London, he used any resource at hand; until at last he succeeded in obtaining from the Government the promulgation of the "Age of Consent Act," which actually puts a stop to infant-marriages and diminishes the chances of early widowhood (1891). Heaven alone knows the persecutions that the noble soul had to bear from the orthodox party; the Brahmanic cliquism is so well able to abuse and revile adversaries! Hindus, generally speaking, are so touchy! They do not like to be lectured by outsiders. The result was that he, Mr. Malabari, who had been the most popular among his contemporaries, when he took social reform in hand, immediately lost his popularity; but he did not care. He had made up his mind, and he accepted the consequences of his generous resolution. He sacrificed excellent opportunities in order to be independent, and set a sublime example of disinterestedness; he refused honors, such as the Shrievalty of Bombay and Knighthood (1887). In return, he gained the admiration of the enlightened few who remained loyal to him. "The country that produces a man of that stamp," said Max Müller, "is not a decadent country, but may look forward to a bright, sunny future, as it can look back with satisfaction, and even pride, on four thousand years of a not inglorious history."

In literature, Mr. Malabari's name is the most familiar to English readers from his well known work, "The Indian Eye on English Life," and his "Guzarat and the Guzaratis." Some peo-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ple see in him "the best among the men whom India is producing, in the course of her new development" under British rule. We admit that there is some force in that description, but we shall here repeat what we have stated elsewhere. There are others of Mr. Malabari's contemporaries who can with equal justice be described as the best products of English education. To him we shall assign a different rôle. "If in the annals of his community Mr. Malabari is the first independent thinker, and, in those of India, the greatest reformer, still in his thought, wholly emancipated, he belongs to the civilization of the world, and, by his work, to the history of Humanity. In fact, Mr. Malabari shines brightest when least indebted to outside influence; in essence, he is a Parsi and an Indian."

Now, though young, he lives almost the life of a recluse, visits Plague Hospitals and Famine Camps. When in Europe, either in Paris or London, he studies social questions and keeps aloof from society. Some day he will again appear with a new ideal, a new aim connected with the welfare of India.

III.

Max Müller long ago pointed out that the extreme simplicity of Parsi-ism is the cause of the great attachment of its devotees, the cause, also, of the rare facility with which the Parsi accepts outward changes without incurring the risk of impeaching his faith. We cannot attempt to sum up the whole history of Zoroastrianism in a few lines. Every one keeps in his memory the glorious career of the Persian Empire. After the Mohammedan Conquest, it disappeared from the view of the world, and for centuries was faithfully preserved in the two small communities of Persia and India. The European scholars were left to their own speculations, and possessed only such information as could be derived from the classics.

When Anquetil Duperron brought Avesta to Europe, it created a great sensation. He gave a new impetus to science, and people know the glorious work done later by Burnouf and his followers. The Parsis, at first, were totally ignorant of the European studies bearing upon their sacred books. In fact, the attacks of a missionary, Dr. J. Wilson, on the question of conversion, obliged the Dasturs to come forward and explain the tenets of their religion. They did it in full earnestness and fairness, preserving their pure

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

traditional doctrine. It was only when Dr. Haug was appointed "Superintendent of Sanscrit Studies in the Poona College," and was brought into contact with the priests, that the distrust subsided. Dr. Haug even collaborated with one of the Dasturs, Hoshanji Jamaspji. Another decisive step was taken by a clever *beh-din,* Mr. K. R. Cama; on his return from Europe, where he had been acquainted with savants of high repute—Spiegel, for instance—he undertook to teach Zend and Phelvi on the modern philological principles, and introduced them among his co-religionists. Now, there is a complete parallelism between the methods of the two schools of Europe and India. The latter produces original works and valuable translations, which do the greatest honor to the community.

Moreover, the Dasturs, who for so long had carefully concealed the tenets of their religion, grew even more and more willing to give information about them. Sometimes, they do not quite agree with the views of our Western scholars. No wonder; science and faith cannot use the same criterion.

Zoroastrianism, or Parsi-ism, is a monotheistic form of religion, not a polytheistic one, as some people would have it. There is but one God under different names, *Mazda, Ahura* and *Ahura Mazda.* He manifested himself to a Bactrian or Median philosopher or reformer, Zoroaster, who is considered to have constituted a religious doctrine, set forth in the sacred books of Avesta. According to Herodotus, the Persians had no images of the Gods, no temples, no altars, and they considered the use of them a sign of folly. The modern Parsis are of the same opinion as their forefathers, and repudiate any representation of the deity.

Zoroaster's speculative philosophy teaches us that the world is the work of two hostile principles, Spenta-Maynu, the good principle, and Angra-Maynu, the evil principle, both serving under one God—the first being the author of whatever is bright and shining, good and useful; the second of what is dark and noxious. The conflict will end in the triumph of the good principle.

The confusion of the philosophical and theological system has given rise to the belief in Dualism, and led to the identification of the principle of good with Ahura-Mazda himself. Let us here quote Dr. Haug, whose authority is so great in these matters. "The Parsis are strict monotheists, and, whatever may have been the views of former philosophical writings, their one Supreme

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Divinity is Ahura-Mazda. Their view of Angra-Maynu seems to differ in no respect from what is supposed to be the orthodox Christian view of the Devil." In man himself we find the same struggle. Salvation depends entirely on his own efforts and deeds; so it becomes his peremptory duty to lead a holy life and to think, to speak and to act righteously. The Mazdazasnian religion enjoins a sublime code of ethics. Mgr. de Harlez has rightly said that the Mazdian religion is distinguished from all other ancient religions in this—that it has a "moral systematized and founded upon philosophic principles." The late lamented Dr. Haug also observes that the moral philosophy of Zoroaster is moving in the triad of thought, word and deed. These three words form the pivot upon which the moral structure of Zoroastrianism turns.

But in the company of holy souls will be the reward of the pure; the wicked will go to the house of impurity and utter darkness. But, at the end of the world (which is to be synchronous with the end of the present cycle), there will be a general purification and regeneration. All souls will be furnished with new bodies and commence a life of ineffable bliss. "Then he (the Saostryant*) shall restore the world, which will (thenceforth) never grow old and never die, never decaying and never rotting, ever living and ever increasing, and master of its wish, when the dead will rise, when life and immortality will come, and the world will be restored at (God's) wish."†

Zoroastrian worship consists of oral recitations of portions of the Sacred Words, or such recitations combined and accompanied with the performance of ritual. The offerings are fruit, flowers, milk, incense, especially the juice of the Haoma plant. The offices are few; they are performed by priests, who constitute a distinct class apart from the rest; no layman can become a priest; no priest can even marry the daughter of a layman. In the priestly class, all the youths now do not pass through the Navar and Martab ceremonies which made them priests (*ervad*). The dignity of *Dastur* is the highest in the craft. Their duties are numerous; they have to attend to the service of the Temples and keep the fire constantly burning there. The ancient Iranians always regarded this element as the symbol of divinity and, as such, worthy of respect; but they never professed themselves to be the worshippers of the Fire. The modern Parsis consider Fire "as

*The Messiah of the Parsis. †Zamyad Yasht, 39.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

an emblem of refulgence, glory and light, as the most perfect symbol of God and as the best and noblest representative of his divinity." Bishop Meurin has given his opinion about Fire reverence in such excellent and choice expressions that we cannot help quoting them. "I am, therefore, very far from supposing that the Parsi Fire Worship is idolatry. Whoever accuses the Parsis of that most heinous of all crimes, and is not able to prove that they believe Fire or Sun to be God himself, is certainly guilty of the most detestable sin of calumny."

The Zoroastrian is not forced to attend places of worship in order to say his prayers, nor to wait for a priest. The old Iranians, as is well known, deemed that nature in all its grandeur is their temple of worship. Often, at Bombay, numbers of Parsis go to the seashore and recite their prayers, with their faces turned to the rising or the setting sun.

The religious obligations of the Parsi are few. Between the age of seven and five, a Zoroastrian must be invested with the *Sudeah* (shirt) and *Kushti* (girdle), which are the visible symbols or emblems of the Mazdazasni religion. The ceremony is called *Naojot* (new or first worship). The candidate declares himself to be a worshipper of Mazda, a follower of Zoroaster, an opponent of *Daevas* (false Gods), and subject to the laws of Ahura. Marriage is blessed by a priest; the outward pomp is, or rather was, totally Hindu. As to death and funeral rites, the ceremonies are most antique; the mode of disposing of the dead on high walls or stone platforms (Towers of Silence) is purely avestic. Of course, it has long been and it still is an object of wonder to foreigners; but, after a consideration of the laws of hygiene and sanitation, the most averse to the custom grow reconciled to it.

A remarkable feature of modern Parsi-ism is the repugnance of the whole community either to proselytism or conversion. It is a fact that the Parsis have always been deaf to the allurements of the Brahmanic worship and to the earnest appeals of Christian missionaries. The coarse Hinduism of the present could not tempt the pure soul of the monotheistic Mazdayasni; as to the appeals of the missionaries, they have been also fruitless for other reasons. The remembrance of the few conversions made by Dr. Wilson (1839) is still very bitter. At that time, a Zoroastrian boastingly could say to the ardent apostle: "With regard to the conversion of a Parsi, you cannot even dream of the event, because

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

even a Parsi babe crying in the cradle is firmly confident in the venerable Zarthust." Since then conversions have been rare.

The best proof of the attachment of the enlightened Parsi to his religion is to be found in Dr. Wilson's *protégé*, Mr. Malabari, whose companion and class-fellow, S. D. B——, embraced Christianity. Mr. Malabari has stated that he resisted the influence of his old and respected friend, simply because he believed in salvation by faith and by word, but did not think the mediation of another absolutely necessary for salvation. However, he is not one of those who speak lightly of Christ. "I know not," he says, "if India will become Christian, and when. But this much I know, that the life and work of Christ must tell in the end. After all, He is no stranger to us Easterns. How much He brings back to us refined and modernized!" As to the missionaries, he fully acknowledges their good service to the cause of civilization.

"We are indebted to them for the first start in the race for intellectual emancipation. It is to them that we are beholden for some of our most cherished political and social acquisitions. . . . . Apart from its active usefulness, the Christian Mission serves as a buffer for the side of scepticism usually inseparable from intellectual emancipation. At a time when doubt and distrust are to take the place of reasoned inquiry among the younger generation of India, I feel bound to acknowledge in my own person the benefits I have derived from a contact with the spirit of Christianity. But for that holy contact, I could scarcely have grown into the staunch and sincere Zoroastrian that I am, with a keen appreciation of all that appeals readily to the intelligence, and a reverend curiosity for what appeals to the heart, knowing full well that much of what is mysterious to man is not beneath, but beyond, the comprehension of a finite being."

The Parsis are totally ignorant of propaganda; they are most tolerant and never attempt to change the creed of any one. Were they always so? Is their present reserve in keeping with the Zoroastrian precepts? It seems that in days of yore they were more zealous. Some ancient treatises are of an essentially propagandist character, and we cannot help alluding to the most severe persecutions that the Christians had to endure under the Sassanian princes. Nevertheless, the Parsis, in India, show the greatest reluctance to increase their number, not only by conversion, but also by any alliance with people of other religions. So that they have to multiply by marrying among themselves; fortunately, they belong to a prolific race, if we consider the small number of the first settlers and their present position.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

IV.

According to the general census of 1891, the number of Parsis then in India was 89,904; 76,774 are quartered in the Bombay Presidency. The city of Bombay has a flourishing Parsi population of 47,498 souls; Surat, 12,757; then we can mention Broach, Thana, Karachi, etc. The priestly town of Nausari is, perhaps, the most important of the settlements outside British territory. The occupations in the lower classes are varied and numerous. It is remarkable that the Parsis have never taken to the more menial employments, such as those of day-laborers, scavengers, palki-bearers, barbers, washermen, grooms, etc. Before the terrible trials of plague and famine, among thousands of mendicants there were only five Parsis, four males and one female. As to the victims of immorality, a Parsi was proud to record that "not a single Parsi female returned herself as living on the wages of shame."*

The Parsis are not exclusively quartered in India. Some are to be found in China (Canton, Macao, Hongkong), Penang, Rio, Mauritius, Cape Town, Madagascar, Australia. We do not mention Europe, where they come frequently, either for study or pleasure, never for a permanent stay, except in London.

We must not forget the small group of the Zoroastrians living in the Persian provinces of Yezd and Kirman. Their condition was for years miserable to a degree. The number of the educated few is limited; the head of the Yezd community is Mr. Ardashir Mihraban, with whom the writer became acquainted through Mr. E. G. Browne, the eminent lecturer on Persian at Cambridge, his guest in Persia. In spite of his endeavors, he has not yet succeeded in raising the intellectual level of his co-religionists. Their social status is very low, indeed; and it is even difficult—this we know from experience—to lighten their burdens, as they are still too ignorant to understand the benefits of certain improvements.

Their condition has been greatly ameliorated by Nasr-Eddin, who, by a Firman, restored them to a footing of equality with his Mohammedan subjects (1882). Their number did not exceed 9,269 in 1891. They are remarkable for their honesty and chastity. Their Indian brethren have started a Fund on their behalf.

* Karaka, "History of the Parsis."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

V.

What is the future of the Parsis? The question is momentous, and it is difficult for an outsider to decide. Socially, they are growing more and more important; the number of their distinguished men is daily increasing, and they have acquired a widespread influence. Now, as to religion, they are certainly more enlightened than their forefathers; but are they the same staunch believers as their predecessors? European rationalism does not spare their sacred books, and the spirit of free inquiry seems to have inflamed some of their young men. It has rightly preoccupied thoughtful philosophers. Mr. Malabari calls his co-religionists "a flock without a shepherd," and he is right. The community lacks unity; that is evidently the weak point. For years and years, the Parsis were led by their own *Panchayet*,* which ceased to exist after the promulgation of the laws of marriage and inheritance. The courts took the place of the *anjuman*.† On the other hand, the authority of the *Dastur Dasturan*,‡ being purely nominal, had ceased also to be effective. So that the two supports, religious and civil, happened to fail at almost the same time.

The Parsis have thus reached a turning point in their national career, a period as important as that when they began to mingle with Mohammedans and Europeans. The revival which followed has not yet ended, and they seem launched on the path of progress; but there are symptoms of such a rapid change in customs and ideals that one feels almost afraid of such rapidity.

Fortunately—if we can say so—all the classes are not yet won over. The contest between the old class and the young one is by no means settled. There are still Parsis in the Mofussil who are steeped in a pure conservatism. These are the very men who will serve as a dam to restrain the violence of the flood. Gradually, they will be gained to the cause of modern education, and they will allow the forward party to try experiments which will guard the new generation against exaggerated theories. They will also learn that they lack cohesion, and that they have to make their own religion and philosophy the guides that they need. Both have aided them in their social development; both will continue to support them in their new modernized life in India and abroad; and both will enable them to wait for the final triumph of the Good Principle.

D. MENANT.

* The National Assembly of the Parsis.
† An assembly.
‡ Lit. Priest of the Priests. High Priest.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A HUNDRED YEARS OF AMERICAN VERSE.*

BY W. D. HOWELLS.

ONE need not quite be at the pains of fancying an amiable privity to Mr. Stedman's plans in the century now rounded to its close, and already rolling away into the past, in order to feel the artistic aptness of its departure at the moment when this could give his work the most definite projection, the most striking relief. But it is certainly pleasanter to indulge such a vagary than to realize that ill-health and an increasing sense of the burden of his task have delayed the appearance of his Anthology till this psychological moment. If it were not for his own frank confession in his very interesting and important Introduction, the fancy might have as great authority as the fact with the reader who turns the pages of his book and perceives how much the Nineteenth Century in America, so far as it was literary, and, more specifically, so far as it was poetical, owes to his patient industry, his judicial discrimination and his instinctive and instructed taste for its due representation to the future. I have another quarrel with the Introduction, however, and perhaps a more serious quarrel than could lie against it for invalidating any fancy of mine, and that is for leaving me, as a critic, so little to say of the quality and character of the verse exhibited. Mr. Stedman has seized the advantage of his prior opportunity to discuss it so comprehensively that one is reduced to the extremity of skirting the edges of the subject, or of repeating him, in terms more or less diaphanous and superfluous, if one enters further upon it.

I.

The really significant question as to the literature of any people is whether it is good; but short of this point one may usefully

* "An American Anthology, 1787-1899. Selections illustrating the Editor's Critical Review of American Poetry in the Nineteenth Century." Edited by Edmund Clarence Stedman. Houghton, Mifflin & Co.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

inquire how much it is their own. I should not venture to say that Mr. Stedman had made an intentional showing of American motives in the American poetry of the last hundred years; but I think he has made a very good showing. What occurs to one almost first in looking his collection over is the very prevalently native character of our verse under conditions and in circumstances where it could not be indigenous. We had not only taken our language from the English, but we had got our whole literary culture and technique from them, down to the smallest convention. There could not be an American metre, say, expressive of some spiritual rhythm peculiar to us. We came into the world when nations were long past inventing such things. For good or for ill, we had come into a civilized world and were joint heirs with the English in a learning as old as the Christianity of the mother isles. But we did not continue altogether in their tradition, though it would not have been surprising if we had. As soon as we felt our national life we began to pipe up in a note at least partly our own; to use an imagery proper to our skies and woods, and to enrich our song from the voices of the environing nature; to color it from our conditions and to kindle it from our aspirations. The American poetry of one hundred years ago no more reflected the English poetry of that day than the American poetry of the present reflects the English poetry of our own time.

This is the fact to which Mr. Stedman's Anthology testifies, rather unexpectedly, I confess, but very convincingly. Our poor beginnings, (and except in one sort they seem to me poor indeed, compared with our present affluence,) might have been richer endings if they had been more docile; but not the less I think the revolt in them divine, just as now I think we are somewhat nobler to be ourselves than to be like the English, without in the least accusing the English of inferiority: I might not be able to make that case out. It seems to me that our earliest poets, as I find them represented by Mr. Stedman's choice, obeyed an instinct articulate in all the terms of our young being when they uttered the American spirit in phrases a little vaunting, perhaps, but undoubtedly exalted. They had not a new language, not a new form, but they had a new hope and a new faith, and the patriotic hymns which they sang to a somewhat sparsely peopled air have an undying echo in our hearts. It may or it may not be a pity that they have now no echo in our verse. They may have said

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

America once for all, or America may have since changed so much that she needs re-wording, and we are waiting to invent a vocabulary; but it is certain that they did say her, those children of her first youth, with a fervor of affection which her latest brood has not emulated. To be sure, the mighty mother was then just taking her high place morally above the other nations at the end of a war waged for the ideal of self-government, and it might be justly urged that she was a more inspiring theme in that bright hour than in this, when she is sunk to the level of the powers that fight to conquer and to colonize. At any rate, they sang her—Hopkinson, Key, Drake and the rest—in strains that still make the wrinkled cheek thrill and glow. Perhaps it is not the finest poetry; perhaps it is only a sort of rhythmical eloquence which the critical reader, wanting the associations of a generous nonage with it, may regard with an amused and tolerant curiosity rather than any stronger emotion. But such as it is, it was not equalled till the second War of Liberation, when we fought free of the slavery we inflicted, as in the first we threw off the subjection we suffered. Both were nobler moments than this, apparently, unless the lyric cry of the Philippine Purchase is merely sticking in the throat of some patient poet till we shall have succeeded in forcing our freedom upon a people who want their own.

Pierpont, Whittier, Longfellow, Emerson, Lowell, Bryant, Channing, Higginson, Brownell, Mrs. Howe and many more all in their several notes united to swell the chorus of the national renaissance, and to recall the music brave and clear, though of so much slenderer volume, which had preluded theirs in the hour of the national nativity. But between the earlier and the later Wars of Liberation there was a long period of suspense and expectation (which, no doubt, seemed to itself a time of settled agreement between the two opposing forces in our civilization, and not a mere *modus vivendi,*) when the American offshoot of English poetry was rooting itself in alien soil and naturalizing itself in alien air. For it must not be forgotten in the heat of our proudest self-assertion, that whatever we are in ourselves, we are that by virtue of having been English, and that if we are now Americans it is because we once wished to be more truly English than the Englishmen.

Politically we became Americans in spite of our first inten-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion, and poetically we became Americans, though knit to English letters by a closer and stronger allegiance than we bore to English laws. The divergence showed itself as decidedly while we were still colonists in whatever was Philip Freneau's peculiar quality, if not so widely as it has since shown itself; and though the quantity of this quality has been fondly exaggerated in his case by retrospective criticism, it has been rather minified than magnified in the case of our earliest national poets generally.

The difference between Bryant and Wordsworth, not to seek any other instance, is as marked as the difference between Longfellow and Tennyson, again not to amplify proofs. If we come to such American names as Poe, and Whittier, and Emerson, and Lowell, there are no English analogues with which they can be yoked by any feat of critical gymnastics. One might as well try to identify the English imagination from which Hawthorne sprang; but the fact is not so much for the pleasure of our vanity as for the instruction of our ignorance. In this matter the venerable law of demand and supply has worked backwards, as usual, and the demand for an American spirit in literature has followed the supply from the beginning. This supply is now so great, this spirit is so intense and pervasive, that if there is to be hereafter any approach to a common ideal, it must be by the English coming to us, and not by our going to them. But probably a reunion like that will not take place, and perhaps it would not be well that it should. Such life as the two peoples have in common, through their inseparable origin and language, is the richer and fuller because of the æsthetic variance which began almost as soon as the Puritans could set up a printing-press on the three hills by Massachusetts Bay.

II.

Not that the printing-press by Massachusetts Bay was ever prescient of an æsthetic destiny, or concerned itself with the tastes of men when they had souls that so much needed saving, or disciplining at the least. Oddly enough, to our modern notion, the æsthetic impulse which so strongly developed itself in New England at last was first felt in the South, where it eventuated in a lyric form of beauty unknown to the North. Freneau, indeed, was native to this Boeotian air of New York, but such poets of fine strain as followed him—Key and Pinkney and Wilde —were Southerners. They wrote songs tender, and gay, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gallant; and it was not till Bryant began to commune with the austere and solitary spirit of Nature in the North, and sparely to touch it to human sympathy, that the primacy of New England in American poetry was fixed. He was nominally of New York, but the material of his verse was the granite of his native Massachusetts hills. It was the truly American thing, and not the less national because it was almost peculiar to him; yet Bryant had not a tenth of the imitators who perished with their master when Poe died. This is the more notable because Bryant's verse was in every schoolbook, and Poe's was only the solace of the morbid youth of post-schooldays. It may be accounted for upon the theory that simplicity is difficult at second hand as well as at first hand, and because of two poets almost equally great in a sense of what may be called the impersonal, the mortal, the psychical—I grope for the right word in vain—the one had a most obvious manner, easy to be aped, and the other had no more manner than the serious and lonely nature he loved to invoke.

What Bryant did was to make American nature habitable to American imagination, and in this way he doubtless pioneered what may be called, for want of a better word, the bucolic school of the West, whose spirit is most, though it was not earliest, recognizable in the work of J. J. Piatt, and which has found in the tender humanity of James Whitcomb Riley and the sensuous susceptibility of Madison Cawein diverse ultimations alike oblivious of their source.

What Poe did was to enlarge our earth and sky by giving us, through the rifts he made in either, glimpses of the preternatural which have a perennial glamour; but the influence of his art, which once so thrilled and fascinated, is no longer felt in our literature. Yet if one comes to naming of names, his must be almost the first, as one perceives with a certain sense of hardship, suspecting as one does something essentially voluntary, not to say mechanical, in his witchery.

There are traces of Bryant before Bryant, as there are after him, in our poetry, but none of Poe. The nature-worship runs all through it; but the supernature-worship begins and ends with a sole hierophant. Was he then our great original; and was he this by virtue of something derived from his environment here, derivable by no other American, or was he ours rather by the acci-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dent of his birth in our quarter of a world where he had nowhere his like or fellow?

III.

The great New Englanders would none of him. Emerson called him "the jingle-man;" Lowell thought him "three-fourths sheer fudge;" Longfellow's generous voice was silenced by Poe's atrocious misbehavior to him, and we can only infer his slight esteem for his work; in a later generation Mr. James speaks of Poe's "very valueless verses." Yet is it perversely possible that his name will lead all the rest when our immortals are duly marshalled for the long descent of time. He belongs, like the poets mentioned, to the golden age of our still youthful rhyme, which Whittier, Holmes, Taylor, Stoddard and Walt Whitman belonged to, and which Mr. Stedman classifies as our second lyrical period. Bryant, who in greatness belongs there with them, is chronologically assigned to the first lyrical period, where he has no compeer, as none of those named quite have, in the third lyrical period, or the fourth, which Mr. Stedman generalizes as "The Close of the Century."

But here, I think, the scrupulous critic would wish to refine upon his assertion, to hedge from his position. Save for their chronology, Taylor and Mr. Stoddard would be classed with Messrs. Stedman and Aldrich and Piatt, who easily distinguish themselves from their companions of the third lyrical period. In their art the New England impulse persists in ways which it is easier to affirm than to define, but which I think their lovers will allow. Neither in them nor in the poets of our more continental development is there so much a decline as a diffusion of the primal and more American impulse. Not the less, but the more, because Emerson, and Longfellow, and Bryant, and Whittier, and Holmes, and Lowell were great, should we feel the fine qualities of Messrs. Harte, and Riley, and Cawein, and Hay, and Sill, and Gilder, and Maurice Thompson, and Lloyd Mifflin, and George Lathrop, and the woman poets of their epoch. If it is not a duty, it is still a pleasure to recognize the unity of all these in a tradition of beauty, which expresses itself differently but not so very unequally in each. I am willing, rather than unwilling, in coming down to the close of the century, to find in Emily Dickinson, in Richard Hovey, in Stephen Crane, in Paul Dunbar, and in Edward Markham assurance of continued vitality in our poets, who, if they no longer roll the psalm to wintry skies,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

or put our national consciousness into verse, or have not, like the great New Englander, the pathos of escape from the imminent deadly moral into the keeping of a somewhat timorous and self-doubting Beautiful, are still poets of as sure calling and election as most of those remembered from the former centuries.

In considering their work it is well also to consider the much greater ease with which immortality used to be achieved. To be quite honest with one's self (at the risk of one's life, rather), it must be owned that the English classics are largely of a quality which leaves even the minor poets of our American anthology little to envy them. They are, in truth, powerfully dull company, as any one must own who has passed much time with them. They do not really exist, but continually perish in a deplorable perpetuity of print; and though it may seem bold to say that our minor poets, as Mr. Stedman has remembered them in his Anthology, are no deader than most of the minor poets in the complete editions of the British poets, still this praise shall be hazarded.

IV.

In some ways, plain to the most cursory glance, they seem not to have sinned so much as their English elders if not betters. It may be that Mr. Stedman has a distaste for satire, or it may be that the mood of the whole world has changed, and no one now likes to write it, but satire is apparently one of the ways in which our poets have not greatly sinned.

The satire of Lowell, who inclined more to it than any other American, from as high a conscience as ever went to it, is represented by a brief passage from "The Fable for Critics," and by one of the less biting of the "Bigelow Papers"—of course, papers can only bite figuratively. Elsewhere there is little trace of a kind of poetry, if it is truly poetry, which so long flourished in the mother-verse of England. With us satire has been political rather than literary, and in one or two eminent instances it has been social, as in Mr. Butler's "Nothing to Wear," and some dashing forays of Mr. Stedman's own; much later than these it has been socialistic in the brilliant work of Mrs. Charlotte Perkins Stetson. But it has at no time been very characteristic of our poetry, and the editor of the American Anthology, whether he meant to intimate its subordinate importance or not, has reduced its representation quite to the ratio of its constituents.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Another sort has been more characteristic of us than the satire which it is remotely akin to. The humorous verse, which amuses rather than moralizes the reader, or is intended to amuse him, has always abounded with us, and survives the decay of satire in perennial flower. Fit selections from Dr. Holmes stand for that direct, that almost didactic, phase of it which we associate with him, and we see it more in profile, in character, in drama, in the pieces chosen from Messrs. Hay, and Harte, and Riley. Of the set, or purposed, comic, such as we find somewhat superabundantly in English verse, there has been comparatively little in our poetry; there has been even less than there has been of satire; and the fact may be Mr. Stedman's justification in altogether omitting that kindly old forgotten droller, John G. Saxe, who once had a place of a certain prominence in our more provincial republic of letters. I think it is rather a pity to have left him out, though I could not precisely say why; but I have a feeling that he was a sort of link between the humorous and satirical, of at least an historical significance.

The narrative poem, or the story in verse, which was once as frequent with us as the humorous character piece is now, is apparently almost as obsolescent as the satire. But at one time nearly every poet, of much or little mark, thought he must do something in the way of it, and in this species Longfellow widely extended his popularity. Whittier less expansively obeyed a kindred impulse, and certain important fragments attest the same intention in Lowell. In those who stand next to these poets the purpose was also rife, and Mr. Aldrich, Mr. Stedman, Mr. Stoddard, as well as Taylor, have written tales in verse, partly or wholly imaginative. The impulse seems to have spent itself before reaching the Pacific Slope, and Mr. Bret Harte satisfied any conscience he had in that way by versifying such of the Californian legends as did not insist upon length. The work of Mr. Joaquin Miller is an instance to the contrary, but even with him the narrative poem is of shorter breath than with the elder poets. Of late Mr. Riley has attempted a tale in rhyme, but rather in the way of bringing together a variety of dispersed impressions and portraits, as Whittier did in "Snow-Bound." The younger poets of the Middle West seem none of them to have tried their prentice-hands in it, and it is not only a very obvious but a very safe thing to note the apparent decline of the species.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The turn of the narrative poem may come again; for some reasons I hope it may; it might do some such office for our common life as the short story has done in prose. In fact, if the absence of the narrative poem is partly an effect of the difficulty which Mr. Stedman would have found in representing it within necessary limits, it may be still with us in much greater force than appears from his Anthology.

I am afraid he is going to be held by posterity to undue responsibility, and I think it the duty of a contemporary to make the reader observe that in the nature of things an anthology is not quite a representation of the editor's preferences. Mr. Stedman hints at this himself, but he could not urge the fact as I should like to do. It was his business to include all phases of our poetry rather than those he liked best, but in the exercise of a judgment at least provisionally sovereign he must expose himself to much resentment and no little revolt. He has made one absolute break, to my thinking, in leaving out a poet of Mr. Edgar Fawcett's fine and rare make; but I fancy this to have been an accident, by no means characteristic of his most faithful and almost exhaustive study of the field. It is possible, of course, that Mr. Fawcett is that American poet, resident in Europe, who wished to be left out; but I am not going to let such a conjecture weaken the ground of the few reproaches I have to make on Mr. Stedman's work. I can understand how in some moods another critic might turn the leaves of the Anthology and not dishonestly accuse him of having left out the most representative things of some poets whom he does represent. But I think this will not be the last mind of any fair-minded critic. In the wonderful affluence of things I find in the book, I have become more and more reconciled to what appears to me rather a virtuous poverty in the things I have not been able to find. I believe we shall become ultimately reconciled to defects which are more suggestive of the physical than the æsthetic limitations of a work so truly monumental, and be willing to accept it as something final in its kind.

It is not likely to be done again in a hurry, and if it were it would not be so well done again. No living man was so well born and so well trained for the task which Mr. Stedman has made our literature his debtor in performing; the spirit of plain simplicity, and the frankness of the personal note in his direct

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

appeals to the reader, have not only a great charm, but add greatly to the value of the purely editorial work. This has related to the distribution of the selections into the several periods already named, to the due provision of a table of contents and the several indices of first lines, and titles, and poets' names, and to the equipment of the volume with a budget of biographical notes, as well as the scholarly Introduction. The last is, of course, wholly Mr. Stedman's work, and the biographical notes, in nearly all of which his quality is felt, are largely his. Where they are not, they still seem to me a satisfactory performance in a sort of work presenting peculiar difficulties; it would have been far easier to do them worse than to do them better, and this I conceive is their sufficient praise.

V.

I should like to return again to the Introduction, before leaving the book, if for nothing but to emphasize my sense of its value by urging the reader not to fail making it his avenue to the pleasaunces beyond. It is so very good, so wise, so just, so kind, that if it did not lead to these, I should still commend its counsel as the best he could have concerning the literature it treats of. But in his idlest and fitfullest saunterings through the volume he will be glad of its companionship, and will see everything more clearly for the light it casts about him. I will not say the way is not quite safe without it, but it will spare the saunterer much disappointment and some needless suffering if he understands from the Introduction that he is not expected to enjoy every step of the way, but is free to feel tired, at times, and even bored. I do not believe, however, that he will feel bored very often, unless he is himself something of that worst kind of bore who is always exacting supreme and final beauty in art. There is much beauty on the way to this ultimate sort which affords the right-minded a distinct pleasure, and the reader will find abundance of the intermediate sort in a course of the American Anthology. Poets are in nothing more delightfully human than in the trick they have of falling below their best; and probably we could not have had Homer at all if we had not allowed him to nod. Certainly we could not otherwise have had many poets in this collection who are of the Homeric habit of nodding. But the reader himself nods at moments, and if he will only nod in unison with the poet, he will have a better time perhaps than he would if he kept always on the alert.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The sort of reasonable reader here imagined will be rather surprised than otherwise, in going through the Anthology, at the great number of familiar poems and lines of poems which he will find. I have been at the trouble, or at the pleasure, of testing it by looking for some favorite piece which is not a general favorite, like Ralph Hoyt's gentle monody, "Old," which always greatly took my fancy; and in turn it has tested me by offering to my knowledge as American certain pieces which to my ignorance had been English. There must be others in the Anthology which my readers will find there with even more surprise, though I shall not expect them to be so candid in confessing it. No doubt we shall meet more frankly on the ground where we are reminded, rather than on that where we are instructed, by the Anthology; and shall more gladly share a common delight in the old familiar things, even if they are not always the old favorite things. For me at least a whole extinct epoch rises again in the ghosts of Willis's poems walking this Anthology, which are mainly so good that it is astounding they should be mainly so dead. When you read them they are very alive, and so are Fitz-Greene Halleck's, even in that old-fashioned fraternal feeling with a people struggling for freedom expressed in his "Marco Bozzaris," which a sense of our own blood-guiltiness has forbidden any actual poet of ours to express in behalf of the two republics lately murdered in South Africa. It is by the sharpest and boldest zigzag that one arrives from this at the two songs chosen to represent the minstrelsy of Stephen Collins Foster, but one cannot help rejoicing that Mr. Stedman found him worthy remembrance. He can hardly be said to live more than many of his betters, but his songs, such as they were, will intimate to the future the pathos of an historical situation that now seems impossible. "My Old Kentucky Home," and "Old Folks at Home," say the simpler sorrows of an oppressed race better than anything else that survives from that dreadful past. Their presence in his Anthology testifies to the catholic spirit in which Mr. Stedman has done his work as impressively as anything I could allege in proof. A certain dignity had to be guarded, which if lost would have left the collection of less unquestionable value, and I think Mr. Stedman has looked to this while using a most generous discretion. Possibly there are other instances of poets with a right to representation there, who have not been invited into his pages, but I have not been

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

able to note more than two, and among such as I have found there I should not be able to note any that had not some claim upon the hospitality which distinctly stops short of charity. Neither the scholarship, nor the sympathy quite as essential in his task, has been wanting to it. No one's standing is established by his presence in these pages, which sometimes certify of an almost or quite forgotten existence; but one may be sure that in every case Mr. Stedman's choice, though never chary, was never unreasoned.

VI.

Apart, however, from all question of the wisdom or unwisdom of Mr. Stedman's choice, what would be the summary of one's impression of a hundred years of our poetry, as derived from his Anthology? One would wish to be honest with one's self if not with one's reader in such a matter, and it would be worse to affect discouragement than encouragement as to the future from things done in the past. It does not very much matter that during the hundred years of our national life we have given no poet to the world like those whose cumulative fame in the long past is not the truest measure of their greatness, but it does very much matter that in each stage of our advance from coloniality we have had adequate expression in our poetry. In our overweening sense of size, we have always been more aware of our length and breadth than our thickness, but if the alien critic feels a comparative thinness in our poetry, he will probably infer that our life has been somewhat wanting in density. Our life is still sparse, and, like our territorial area, it has been cultivated here and there only. It has not been wanting in high moments; it has flowered in heroic events, and fruited in as rich results as any national life known to the history of the race. But it is one of the most grotesque and unfounded of the superstitions that such facts have ever been mainly the stuff of poetry. Which of the national epics treats of the national epochs? We have only to ask ourselves such a question in order to realize how absurd a kindred expectation of achievement from our own poets must be. The national epics, the Iliad, the Cid, the Nibelungen Lied, and the like, have their roots in the fabulous aforetimes which antedated national history and even national consciousness, and were heroical merely and personal. So far as an alien race like ours could provide its habitat with a national epic in this sort, we have furnished it in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Longfellow's "Hiawatha." But if we insist upon a civic sense as the measure of value in our poets' work, they will be found as equal to the test as the poets of other peoples. It is very doubtful indeed if the stirring of a national conscience concerning a national wrong ending in a national tragedy has ever been more fully witnessed in a national poetry than the long struggle against slavery was witnessed in ours. The period of that immense psychological experience was the period of our highest achievement in poetry; our noblest poets belonged to that time; and though comparatively little of their work directly related to it, it is to their enduring honor and ours that not one of these was silent or indifferent in the presence of our ordeal. After the ordeal there was inevitable lapse from the high mood in which the highest things were done, but what has been done since is at least worthy of what we have ourselves been since. In fact, we have never since, in our fat prosperity, lived up to the ideal beauty of our poetry. I do not mean by any or all of this that the mood of a time directly embodies the fact of a time; but I am quite sure that if it is high, it characterizes all the arts with a certain exaltation. In a way, therefore, it depends upon our behavior as a people whether we shall again have a poetry of the type in which we once surpassed all other peoples: the type in which humanity responds more truly than nationality can to the divinity that shapes our ends.

W. D. HOWELLS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED